THE SOCIAL THINKING
OF THE
UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN AMERICA
1918 - 1948

by
Harold Haas

A Thesis
Submitted to the Division of Christian Sociology
in Drew Theological Seminary of Drew University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

Volume 2

Madison, New Jersey
- 1953 -

Approved by:

_____
Major Professor

225651, cop. 2

CHAPTER XIV

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE

The Christian Church has from its very beginning emphasized the importance of the institutions of marriage and the family. It perceived that in these institutions was to be found the basic unit of group life, and, further, that both Church and State had a deep stake in them. Since this has been both historically and consistently true of the whole Christian Church, it is to be expected that the U.L.C.A. falls into the same pattern in this regard. Actually, marriage and the family differ somewhat from the other problems we are considering in this section in that there are deep spiritual implications concerned which have always been recognized by the entire Church.

The years between 1918 and 1948 saw sharp changes taking place in marriage and the family, changes which had begun at an earlier period, but which became accelerated through these three decades. The change of the United States from a dominantly rural to a dominantly urban culture, the vastly more efficient means of transportation and communication, the rise of a philosophy of individualism, the changed status of women, all contributed to changed and changing functions of marriage and family life. The instability of these institutions was reflected in the rising divorce rate. "In 1870 the divorce rate in the U.S. was one divorce for every 17 marriages. This rate steadily increased until in 1921 there was one divorce to about every 9 marriages. It was about this time that

the divorce rate of the U.S. became the highest of any country in the world. In 1930 there was one divorce to every 5.9 marriages, and during the depression, although the total number of both marriages and divorces decreased, the proportionate divorce rate went still higher. The aftermath of World War II accelerated this trend so that in 1946 the divorce rate for the U.S. was slightly more than one divorce for every 4 marriages."[1]

What was the reaction of the U.L.C.A. to this whole situation and what was its conception of the proper function of marriage and the family, and the place of divorce as well, as social institutions?[2] As a background to the more extended discussion of the periodical literature, we shall again first examine the actions of the U.L.C.A. and its constituent Synods, which will be found to be quite meager and scattered in scope.

The basic official statements of the Church on the subjects of marriage, the family and divorce were made in 1928 and 1930.[3] On the whole, the actions taken then have stood until the present day as the guiding action for the entire Church. The Committee on Moral and Social Welfare presented to the U.L.C.A. in 1928 an extended statement on the family. Concern over the disintegration of so much of family life was expressed. The report indicated several principles which ought to govern family living. These principles are stated in very general terms, but do give something of the conception of the U.L.C.A. of true Christian family life. Because of the determinative nature of this report for the U.L.C.A., it is presented at length:

> 1. ...the first (principle) to be held in view is that the family as an institution belonged by divine appointment to the natural order and constitutes an indispensable factor

in the orderly governance of the life of mankind. Nothing in the way of adjustment, therefore, which would tend to weaken the family tie should be countenanced....

2. The second principle is that parenthood is not only a great privilege, but also a great responsibility, involving obligations which cannot be neglected without serious consequences. Children have a right to the time, labor and sacrifice which their proper nurture and training demand, and any social arrangement which is inclined to lead to their neglect needs to be condemned.

There is a growing tendency at the present day to justify the claim of womanhood to the right of supplementing the vocation of motherhood with some other vocation in life. Mothers in increasing numbers are engaging in some remunerative employment or following careers which necessitate their absence from the home for the greater part of the day. In some instances it is maintained that economic pressure makes it compulsory for the wife to add to the family income; in others, that the wife and mother has equal right with the husband and father to make her contribution to the larger work of the world.

Whether the present trend represents a temporary phenomenon of our social life or a permanent change of attitude the future alone can reveal. Under any circumstances, however, it cannot be viewed otherwise than with serious misgivings. The question is not one of woman's capacity to earn, or ability to make worthy contributions to the life of the world. This is freely granted. It is a question of the dignity, worth and primary obligation of motherhood. Where the mother's continued absence from the home involves the neglect of children during the most formative period of their lives, no accomplishment in other fields can atone for the harm which is done. This must remain the conviction of the church and constitute a part of the instruction which she is to impart to Christian young womanhood.

3. The third principle is that the true unity of the family can be maintained only by a process of mutual self-impartation, which seeks the good of the family as a whole, while at the same time safeguarding the integrity and worth of each individual member.

4. The fourth principle is that true religion is essential to the maintenance of a real home.[4]

As a result of this presentation, the convention adopted the following:

That the family is a divine institution and that the orderly governments of the life of mankind is directly dependent upon the preservation of <u>its</u> integrity and stability.

That in view of the unique relation in which parents and children stand to one another, any social arrangement which tends to separate children from their parents arbitrarily or unnecessarily is opposed to the common good and needs to be condemned.

That the unity and stability of the family can be maintained most effectively through the cultivation of a mutual good will which will constrain each member to seek the good of all and not a merely selfish happiness.

That genuine good will between the members of a family can best be cultivated through the power of true religion. Therefore, be it resolved,

1. That pastors be urged to testify clearly and emphatically to the value and necessity of religion in order that the family as an institution may be maintained against the forces which are tending to undermine it at the present day.
2. That, inasmuch as the example and precept of godly parents is a far greater potency than any reform or prohibitive measures which may be proposed or attempted to combat the divorce and other evils which threaten the family, Christian parents be exhorted to make the home the true nursery and training school of Christian living.
3. That the Church seek in every way to assist parents in the discharge of this duty, by encouraging the practice of family worship and by introducing into the curricula of its schools such material as will help to inculcate Christian ideals of marriage and family life in the youth.[5]

At the same convention, this Committee dealt with the question of divorce by means of a series of recommendations which it sought to have the Church adopt.[6] After extensive discussion, these recommendations were referred back to the Committee for further study and report at the next convention. At the following convention of the Church, in 1930, a slightly revised statement on marriage and divorce was presented to the Church, which statement was adopted as the official position of the U.L.C.A. The following represents to the present day the official stand of the U.L.C.A. on marriage and divorce:

> 1. The United Lutheran Church, in accordance with the teachings of the Scriptures, holds that marriage is a holy estate, ordained by God, and to be held in honor by all. It deeply deplores the increasing disregard of the sanctity of the marriage tie, and solemnly protests against all teachings

and practice which violate this sanctity and are therefore contrary to the revealed will of God.

2. It urges its pastors to instruct their people regularly and systematically in the meaning and responsibilities of marriage; to seek to maintain among them a Christian conscience on divorce; to be ready, whenever conditions demand it and opportunity offers, to bring the Gospel of reconciliation to bear upon those who may be in serious danger of estrangement; and in general to minister through Word and Sacrament to that growth and grace which is the only effectual safeguard against the moral laxity of the times.

3. While it is indispensable that a pastor in performing a marriage comply with every civil requirement, we maintain that he is also accountable to God, and that he therefore not only has the right, but should feel constrained, to refuse to perform any marriage which, so far as he has had the opportunity of discovering after earnest endeavor to ascertain the facts, is not in accordance with divine requirements. The rite of Christian marriage is a service of the Church and its distinctively religious character when performed by a minister of the Church should never be subordinated to other considerations.

4. With respect to divorce we hold that marriage according to the will of God is indissoluble and is normally terminated only by the death of either party. When it is otherwise dissolved the will of God is frustrated. In general, therefore, all divorce is to be condemned, and, whenever possible, avoided.

5. A great body of the leading thinkers of the Lutheran Church in the past have taught that the marriage bond is effectually dissolved by the sins of adultery and malicious desertion, and that, when a divorce has been legally granted for either of these causes, the innocent party is free to marry again. This position we now reaffirm.

6. With respect to the remarriage of divorced persons the United Lutheran Church recommends to its constituent synods that they insist that their pastors abide by the rule that only the innocent party to a divorce which has been granted on scriptural grounds can be remarried under the auspices of the Lutheran Church during the lifetime of the other party, and then not until the expiration of a year after the divorce shall have been granted.

7. The matter of retaining within, or admitting to, the membership of the Church persons who have been divorced on other than scriptural grounds and who have remarried during the lifetime of the former husband or wife falls under the rule of discipline provided for by the constitution of the congregation. In all such instances pastors and church councils are exhorted to proceed with care and true spiritual wisdom, having proper regard for the Church's purity and honor, but also mindful of her mission to minister the means of grace so that sinners may be converted, restored and saved.[7]

Beyond this official action, nothing appears in the Minutes of the U.L.C.A. concerning marriage and divorce with the exception of occasional references to available literature on the subject or requests for literature. For example, in 1936, the representatives to the Federal Council reported that a booklet, "Safeguarding Marriages," and a study course entitled, "Building the Christian Family," had been prepared.[8] Also, in the same year, a Memorial was received from the Ministerium of Pennsylvania requesting the U.L.C.A. "to secure the publication of literature setting forth the attitude of the Church toward the marriage relation in all its phases."[9] This was referred to the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare with instructions to prepare the desired literature.

In 1944, the New York Synod presented a Memorial calling attention to the difficulties arising from mixed marriages, particularly with members of the Roman Catholic Church. It, therefore, asked the Church "to prepare and distribute a statement informing and advising our Lutheran youth as to the pre-marital, contractual requirements of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the up-bringing of children resulting from mixed marriages between Roman Catholics and our youth."[10] This request was referred to the Board of Social Missions for action.

The actions of the constituent Synods of the U.L.C.A. were also very few. Some of them presented very general statements; others were concerned with fairly specific items which might help to promote better marriage and family life. The Committee on Inner Missions of the North Carolina Synod in 1923 stressed the importance of the family

as a unit of organization. "From that little circle (the family,)" it wrote, "proceed all the principles and forces that go to make up the social fabric."[11] Furthermore, this report gave its approval to state laws requiring a minimum age for marriage, forbidding miscegenation and marriages within certain degrees of consanguinity. It believed that the Synod should advocate uniform divorce laws for the country, but did not indicate on what basis such laws should be written.

In the following year, the Ohio Synod urged its pastors to stress the Christian home. "The Christian home," it stated, "is one of the greatest units in the promotion of our religious life. The rapidly increasing number of divorces, granted as they are upon almost any pretext, is having a destructive effect on the home. Associated with this evil are a number of others equally destructive of home and its influence. Because of the complexity of our social life it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory method of combatting these evils. We believe, however, that it is important that our pastors use every proper opportunity to emphasize to their people the glory of the Christian home with its ideals and its altar."[12] A similar resolution was passed by the Virginia Synod in 1927 asking pastors to use every opportunity to speak about the "Christian family, the family altar (and) the divorce scandal...."[13]

Several Synods concerned themselves specifically with divorce, particularly urging federal marriage and divorce laws. The Virginia Synod in 1927 urged the state "to pass more stringent marriage and divorce laws." Moreover, it went on record "as favoring a Federal marriage and divorce law," and expressed its belief that adultery was

the only legitimate grounds for divorce.[14]

The East Pennsylvania Synod in 1932 stressed the task of ministers with reference to divorce, asking each pastor to refuse "to grant the blessing of the Church upon unknown couples and upon those people about whom he has reasonable doubts as to the success of the marriage."[15] Similarly, years later the Kansas Synod expressed its concern over evils connected with marriage such as getting married on chance acquaintance, marriage mills, etc., and urged its pastors to give careful instruction, especially to youth, to combat these evils.[16]

In 1939, the New York Synod received a report of its Committee on Moral and Social Welfare which contained rather specific recommendations. These included an expression of satisfaction at a recent state law requiring blood tests for all applicants for marriage certificates, suggesting further legislation requiring psychiatric examinations, recommending seminary courses on "sexology and psychiatry," asking for courses to be prepared by the Church on instruction in the facts of sex, and requesting a synodical declaration on the subject of birth control.[17] The Synod was not prepared for all of this, however, and approved only the action by the State requiring blood tests for marriage applicants. For the rest of the recommendations, it simply adopted a general substitute, "that Synod call upon its pastors, teachers and parents to revaluate in Christian education the need to emphasize the sacredness of all life and the study of the problems of sex, in order that the youth of the Church be properly prepared for life's sacred responsibilities."[18]

In 1948, the State of South Carolin[illegible]

subject of changing the state constitution that divorce might be made legal in that State, the only one in the union in which it was prohibited completely. This prompted the Social Missions Committee of that Synod [19] to give a fairly extensive report. It pointed out the centrality of the Christian family and the action of the United Lutheran Church in 1930 permitting two causes as justifiable for divorce. This it believed to be a scriptural stand. The State, however, was suggesting allowing divorce "on the grounds of adultery, desertion, physical cruelty, or habitual drunkenness." Because of this, the Committee went on to say: "Notice the wide difference between the position of our Church and the Legislature on divorce. Our Church has two causes, and only the innocent party may again marry. The Legislature has four causes, and three of the four are very broad and indefinite, and both parties in the divorce are at liberty to marry again.... It is the judgment of the Committee that this proposed amendment would put the stamp of approval by a Christian State on moral, domestic, social and civic issues which would be unwarranted [illegible]. Therefore we [illegible] our

however, was permitted to the innocent party on the "scriptural grounds" of adultery and malicious desertion; (4) that the Church was constantly urging its pastors, teachers, leaders and parents to do everything possible to promote true Christian family life.

It is cause for some speculation as to why the U.L.C.A. devoted so little attention to this problem which it admitted as basic, which was a growing problem on the social scene, and which in many ways had more directly obvious moral and spiritual implications than some of the other problems to which more extensive attention had been given by the Church. This cannot be answered with any authority. There may have been a strain of thinking (although unexpressed) that marriage and divorce were largely civil matters and thus must be left to the State to settle by legislation. There is some indication of the thinking that the Church felt that it could do little more than convert and educate for Christian character, through which true family living would be possible. Moreover, the fact that the Church in 1930 adopted a definitive statement on marriage and divorce perhaps tended to stifle further official discussion of the subject. Whatever, the cause, it

(6) Statements on birth control.

It was in good measure the Lutheran Church at the time of the Reformation which helped to transfer the control of marriage from the Church to the State, and which denied the sacramental aspect of marriage.[21] Did this mean that marriage was thereby completely secularized and had no more religious meaning than any other civil contract? This was not the original Lutheran position, nor, while recognizing that marriage was a civil contract, was it the position of the U.L.C.A.

Gerhard Lenski has pointed out that Luther reacted against both the authoritarian approach of the Roman Catholic Church and the purely individual approach of the Anabaptists.[22] As a result, he turned "to the new form of the state-church and to his conception of the state as the protector of the church, placing under the care of the state many matters which, formerly controlled by papal authority, were now being regarded as matters of conscience by the Anabaptists and others."[23]

In spite of the fact that marriage had been placed in the hands of the State, its continuing spiritual nature in the original Lutheran interpretation is pointed out as follows:

> -In general, in the Lutheran order, the control of marriage becomes specified as a matter for civil and state concern.... While this may seem to be a secularizing of a matter hitherto held either sacramental in the Roman Church or as highly spiritual and subjective in the Anabaptist formulation, it is safe-guarded from any gross or merely practical and utilitarian conception by reason of the intensely spiritual character which Luther would assign both to it and also to the functions of state and government as well. Civil magistrates, directing marriage and enforcing law and order,... are God's agents as much as the ordained and called members of the clergy who preach the Gospel and administer the Sacraments. Marriage, therefore, though it rest under civil control, is altogether sacred as an institution, and by such civil control the human family is bound to be served far more advantageously and fairly than it ever could be by any arrangement vested

> merely in the Roman hierarchy or in the capricious and uncertain judgment of the individual conscience....24

It is precisely this traditional Lutheran interpretation that the U.L.C.A. was interested in upholding. While denying a sacramental character to marriage and admitting the validity of marriage as a civil contract, the writers of the U.L.C.A. have all insisted that it is far more than the latter. "Marriage is a divine institution," states a study booklet,"'a holy estate ordained of God, and to be held in honor by all.' God unites a man and woman; 'what therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' 'They twain shall be one flesh;' marriage is 'a profound biological-spiritual experience which comes out of the depths of life.'" Beyond this, marriage is "also a socio-legal contract... a human companionship,... (and it) provides the only divinely sanctioned means of perpetuating the human race...."[25]

Because marriage has its source in God's will, those who enter into this estate have a responsibility, beyond their responsibility to the State, to God Himself. "...The Protestant Church teaches that marriage is part of the creative order of God.... Christianity... cannot be satisfied to look upon marriage as purely and solely a civil rite."[26]

An editorial in The Lutheran attributes the growing evil of divorce to unchristian views of marriage such as the idea that it is simply a civil contract.

> ...the Church... cannot rest satisfied with a conception that regards marriage as a purely civil contract. It is that; but it is vastly more. It must insist that God has a right to be a party to that contract.... The institution of marriage in Genesis, the solemn and sacred obligations that go with it, and that are brought out with such clearness in the whole Old Testament, put a divine stamp upon it which the State is incapable of affixing. In the New

> Testament, its divine significance is brought out in still brighter colors. The relation between husband and wife is compared with that which exists between Christ and His Church. It would not be possible to give it a higher and holier status than that gives it....[27]

It must be remembered that all U.L.C.A. writing was based upon the Lutheran teaching that the family is one of the basic orders of creation - along with Church and State. Consequently, it, and the institution which gave it stability, namely, marriage, could never be subject simply to human convenience or merely controlled by the State. As an order of creation, the family - and marriage - found their focus in the will of God. His will was revealed in the Scriptures. As the U.L.C.A. interpreted these, marriage was seen to be a lifelong union of one man and one woman for the purposes of procreation, the finding of fulfillment in one another, and a means by which ideals could best be preserved and nourished.

Although this was its basic conception of marriage, the U.L.C.A. also had to face up to the fact of divorce. There is no doubt but that many within the Church were greatly disturbed by the rising divorce rate. "Far more dangerous," wrote the editor of The Lutheran in 1919 "than the pestilence that once bore that name is a Black Plague that sweeps unchecked and almost unreproved through our land every year. The mere facts... should be sufficient to awaken the reader to a realization of the moral danger involved. The figures recently given out by the Census Bureau showing that one marriage in every nine is terminated by divorce, are startling."[28] At another time he said, "The divorce evil has become a menace. No single evil in the country today is cutting a deeper gash into the vitals of the nation than it...."[29]

All who wrote on this subject agreed that the Church must take the matter of divorce seriously. Before the U.L.C.A. took its official stand on the question of divorce in 1930, however, there seemed to be two divergent tendencies among the writers of the U.L.C.A. concerning justification for divorce. One was in the direction that only the words of Christ concerning adultery gave any clear scriptural authority for divorce. The other was in the direction that causes for divorce was a matter for the spirit rather than of legalistic definition, even if the latter could be justified by Scripture.

In 1929, after the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare had originally presented a statement on divorce to the U.L.C.A., The Lutheran carried an article which sought to interpret scriptural teaching on both marriage and divorce. It pointed out "that marriage is dissolved normally only by the death of either husband or wife. When its dissolution is brought about in any other way, the will of God is frustrated. Divorce therefore is condemned and should, wherever possible, be avoided. It is never a constructive remedy for the ills of married life, but is an evil arising from the sinfulness of the heart."[30] This author felt that Scripture clearly showed that adultery broke the marriage bond and declared the innocent person free to marry again. Desertion, however, he thought, was "considered a legitimate cause for separation but such separation does not carry with it the right of a second marriage...."[31]

There were some, on the other hand, who felt that this attempt to establish "causes" was unfortunate from the point of view of the Scriptures. An extensive article was published in The Lutheran Church Review in 1924. Its argument dealt with the difference in the function of

Church and State with regard to divorce. The author points out that Church and State are governed by different motives in dealing with the problem of divorce, and that the motives of one cannot be intermingled with those of the other. Since "it is the very nature of a State to be principally guided by the needs of a people and by the principle of expediency,"[32] the Church is not to condemn it if it enacts divorce laws which are something less than the divine ideal. In spite of this, he felt that there should be cooperation between the Church and State in defining bases for divorce. His conclusions are as follows:

> 1. In the ideal sense, marriage is a union between man and wife which is not to be dissolved except by death.
> 2. The marriage bond is absolutely broken by adultery.
> 3. Other very serious reasons may be regarded as justifying divorce, but such reasons should be carefully defined by the Church and by the State co-jointly. Under no condition should divorce be granted "for every cause."[33]

In 1930, shortly before the U.L.C.A. adopted its statement on divorce, Dr. Raymond Stamm pleaded vigorously against the adoption of legalistic causes for which divorce could be justified. He maintained that this was against the spirit of Christ and a false interpretation of Scripture:

> The proper principle is that of the reciprocal interaction between Scripture and the growing Christian apprehension of the ideal family life controlled by the Spirit of Jesus. This means that what the Bible has to say about divorce must be interpreted in the light of the concept of development, that is, in the light of things as the Spirit of God through our growing human experience gives us to see that they ought to be. We must go to Scripture, not for detailed directions for legislation which must apply to situations which have hundreds of new and complicating factors as compared with the conditions under which the writers of the New Testament lived, but for that inspiration of the Christ who is portrayed there which will make men willing to pay the price in human effort by which alone

> the ideal married life can be achieved.
>
> No mistake could be greater than to treat the teachings of Jesus as legislation, whether prohibitive or permissive. He was setting forth ideals; He stated the moral and spiritual consequences of failure rather than legal penalties; if for any cause a man divorce his wife, their permanent union intended by God is broken and the ideal is missed, in that the potential personalities which might have been developed are now forever impossible.[34]

It is interesting to note that after the U.L.C.A. adopted its official statement on marriage and divorce in 1930, virtually all discussion of the issue ceased in the periodical literature of the Church. This does not mean that all elements within the U.L.C.A. have been totally satisfied by the statement of the Church. The U.L.C.A. has simply placed its official stand concerning the remarriage of divorced persons on the consciences of individual pastors. It is acknowledged, however, that there is a wide diversity in the actual practice of these pastors.[35]

Thus, while the Church recognized that it had a deep stake in marriage, and therefore in divorce as well, there is not much question but that it was usually content to allow the State to make all of the rules governing these institutions without statements of either affirmation or protest on the part of the Church. Dr. Lenski pointed out that as long as the Church allows the State to control marriage, so the Church inevitably has a responsibility for the character of the State which it must exercise:

> Having followed Luther a considerable distance, Lutherans, it would seem, have not followed him far enough. Willingly accepting his idea to transfer the control of marriage from the church to the state, they have found it hard to make the state the holy, spiritual institution that Luther desired it to be. Again and again the descendants of a virile Luther have tolerated and accepted with the utmost

> complacency the authority of a state that was as devoid of true spirituality as are the kingdoms of the heathen who do not know God. Again and again they have regaled their souls on pure doctrine while the state, of which they were a vital part, was allowed to go its way, unrebuked, though engaged in projects definitely unchristian. In the meantime, what has happened to marriage? Has it not drifted from the high plateau of sacramental esteem into the low valley of a purely human and natural function? Has it not become invested with a naturalism, a utilitarianism, a disposition to lend itself to change and experiment, all of which have proven themselves progressively damaging to the peace and the welfare of the human family?[36]

The instability of marriage and the family brought forth suggestions from various sources outside the Church of various radical solutions. As can be expected, these were almost universally condemned by Lutheran writers. An early issue of The Lutheran, for example, enumerates some of the conditions of the early marriage and divorce legislation of the Soviet Union. This brought forth the condemnation that "the system is equitable in economics and iniquitous in morals. It makes the family a function of the state, not of religion. The ties are legal and not natural. Of course, it will change, because it is inhuman and ungodly."[37] The attitude of the courts in granting divorces on frivolous grounds was also condemned.[38] Likewise, "Companionate Marriage," as advocated by Judge Lindsey, was thoroughly repudiated.[39] It was definitely the feeling of Lutheran writers that the institution of marriage did not need radical revision, but rather that it needed to be upheld in a Christian spirit.

Yet, society was still faced with evident instability in the institution of marriage. What solutions, if any, were offered by U.L.C.A. writers? The editorial voice of The Lutheran was occasionally raised suggesting that every Christian church body should make a

"ringing declaration on the subject, and forbid its ministers to solemnize marriages of divorced persons save on the sole ground of proved innocence where adultery, and that only, enters into the case;"[40] that all the different church bodies should meet in a free conference to plan for united action on the problem;[41] that the pulpit and Sunday School should be more explicit in teachings about marriage;[42] that divorced people should be publicly ostracized,[43] and that greater discipline should be taught and exercised in the home.[44]

One article, however, pointed out that mere restrictions would never solve the evil of divorce. "We have temporarily lost sight of the principle," the writer said, "...that to be valid a contract must be mutually beneficial. We are saying to the married pair: 'no matter how unsatisfactory, how detrimental to your happiness, how galling you have found your marriage contract to be, having once made it you must stand by it, live under it and up to it.' That dictum will never solve our problem. It will never cure the divorce evil."[45] It is this author's belief that the Church must give its youth candid and comprehensive instruction that is not based on restriction alone. Similarly, another article pleaded against solutions based on restrictions and pointed out that the Church can do an effective job in helping to stabilize marriage and family life by more adequate teaching, counseling, literature and programs.[46]

As was the case with a few of the Synods, several writers felt that uniform national divorce laws would help better the present situation.[47] In addition to this, it was suggested that society should provide for better legislation to see that marriages between the unfit were

prevented, a greater amount of education for marriage was provided, and provision for counseling for those who are having marital difficulties was made.[48]

It is generally recognized that the changed status of women in society is one of the contributing factors to a higher divorce rate. Our only source for the attitude of the U.L.C.A. toward the proper status of women (with the exception of the 1928 action of the U.L.C.A. itself) is in an occasional editorial in The Lutheran in the early years. These editorials were all for the general idea that women were completely equal to men. It was stressed, however, that men and women have specialized tasks to do, and that the task of women was to be found essentially within the home. As a result of World War I, many women had entered into new areas of work. The conclusion of The Lutheran was that "it is certain that under the new order which brings women into business and politics, and what not, the home is suffering untold loss.... Who will deny that the situation is unnatural and abnormal?"[49]

Neither the U.L.C.A. nor any of its Synods have ever taken any official stand with reference to birth control. In fact, the subject has been almost completely ignored in the literature of the Church. In 1931, however, the Federal Council of Churches released a statement that was generally in favor of the practice of birth control under certain circumstances. Immediately after, the President of the U.L.C.A., Dr. F.H. Knubel, wrote the following comments on this statement which are essentially negative:

> It is of prime significance that the present agitation for birth control occurs at a period which is notorious for looseness in sexual morality. This fact creates suspicion as to the motives for the agitation and should warn trueminded

> men and women against the surrender of themselves as tools for unholy purposes.
>
> The duty of the Church is now possibly more than ever to proclaim the holiness of the sexual relation, as well as temperance in the use thereof. There will then be no need for birth control.
>
> Even if the State should ever discover facts and conditions which could conceivably render necessary the exercise of birth control, only such an arrangement for it should be devised as would, because of its stringency, give no comfort to those who consciously or unconsciously are promoting loose morals. Anything else would serve to weaken the foundations of the home, and therefore of the State itself. There is little evidence, however, that the advocates of birth control would be satisfied with such a stringent provision.[50]

There is only one other article that dealt in any way with this question. This was incidental to the main theme of premarital counseling. The general conclusion was that it must be left to the individual conscience guided by the Scriptures:

> If the Scriptures have no definite yea or nay in this matter, it falls in the category of questions concerning which each believer will have to seek the mind of God. Each couple will want to be assured that whatever their decision, they have a conscience void of offense, that the Spirit of God witnesses with their spirit that they have acted in conformity with the will of God. It goes without saying that contraceptives can never be right when used outside of the marriage relationship. It is also clear that they cannot abrogate God's command, "Be fruitful and multiply" - unless there by very special health reasons. It must be treated as a stewardship, something for which one must give account, something that has been used responsibly.[51]

This principle of leaving the issue of birth control to the individual conscience is the controlling one in the U.L.C.A. today. It should be pointed out, however, that at some inter-Lutheran conferences, participated in by the U.L.C.A., statements favorable to birth control or planned parenthood have been made. The Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., for example, distributed one such throughout the entire

Church.[52]

By way of summary of the basic material of this chapter, it can be seen that the general conception of the U.L.C.A. toward marriage was that it was "a holy estate ordained of God and to be held in honor by all." Although marriage was not considered a sacrament of the Church, it was regarded as something having definite religious and spiritual implications. It was instituted by God. It was a lifelong union between one man and one woman. The purposes of marriage were for the procreation of children according to God's will, and for the completion of the man and the woman in one another. According to God's plan, marriage was to be terminated only by the death of either party. The family was considered to be one of the basic orders of creation along with the Church and State.

The U.L.C.A. was shocked by the rapidly rising divorce rate of the nation. This shock was occasioned by its conception that divorce was totally against the will of God. This seemed to be clearly revealed in the Scriptures in the teachings of Jesus. Where God's will prevailed fully, there would be no divorce.

The practical situation in which an ever increasing number of marriages were being broken forced the U.L.C.A. to define its stand more clearly. In so doing, it went to the Scriptures and interpreted what it found there in terms of justification for divorce on the grounds of adultery or malicious desertion, and permitted the remarriage of the innocent party after a time interval of one year. It was the belief of the Church that since only these two causes are mentioned in Scripture, they are the only two possible causes upon which a divorce

can be granted. At the time that the official statement was adopted (1930), the only voiced dissent was to the effect that this interpretation was too liberal although writers within the Church had previously pleaded that the Church should not adopt any legalistic standard even if it seemed that it could be justified on scriptural grounds. Separation, although it broke a marriage as completely as did divorce, was never given any real consideration in the U.L.C.A. It seems, however, to be condoned when the situation becomes intolerable upon any grounds for either party.

The official statement of the U.L.C.A. has stood as the chief witness of the Church to God's will on marriage and divorce in our society up to the present day. It has been pointed out, however, that there is in all probability a wide latitude of practice among the pastors of the U.L.C.A.

In spite of the evident instability of marriage in present day society, the U.L.C.A. did not feel that the institution needed any radical alteration. It thoroughly condemned all such suggestions that were set forth. Rather, both Church and State were looked to for increased activity in the direction of providing people with a better basis for happily married life.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter XIV Marriage and Divorce

1. Emory S. Bogardus, Sociology (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), third edition, p. 80.

2. For an extended treatment of the Lutheran conception of marriage and divorce, from Martin Luther through contemporary ideas in the American Lutheran Church, see Gerhard E. Lenski, Marriage in the Lutheran Church (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1936).

3. This was the result of a Memorial presented to the 1924 convention of the U.L.C.A. asking that such a study be made. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1924, p. 493.

4. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1928, pp. 583 ff.

5. Ibid., pp. 585 and 586.

6. Ibid., p. 594.

7. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1930, pp. 111 and 112. A conscientious protest by the Rev. C.H. Little was recorded in the Minutes (p. 207) to the effect that Scriptures allow only one cause, namely, adultery.

8. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1936, p. 80.

9. Ibid., p. 357.

10. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1944, p. 421.

11. Minutes, North Carolina Synod, 1923, p. 59.

12. Minutes, Ohio Synod, 1924, p. 99.

13. Minutes, Virginia Synod, 1927, p. 66.

14. Loc. cit. As the U.L.C.A. was preparing its official statement on divorce, one of the basic contentions was whether or not malicious desertion could be admitted as a justifiable cause for divorce.

15. Minutes, East Pennsylvania Synod, 1932, p. 101.

16. Minutes, Kansas Synod, 1943, p. 60.

17. Minutes, New York Synod, 1939, p. 108.

18. Ibid., pp. 187 and 188.

19. There are references to marriage and divorce in the report of this committee in 1945 (Minutes, pp. 94 and 95) but without specific suggestions or actions.

20. Minutes, South Carolina Synod, 1948, pp. 121 and 122.

21. See Gerhard Lenski, "The Church's Responsibility in Marriage," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1938, XI, 3, esp. pp. 252 ff.

22. See Gerhard Lenski, Marriage in the Lutheran Church, Chapter IV and esp. pp. 102 ff.

23. Ibid., p. 102.

24. Ibid., p. 103.

25. Earl S. Rudisill, Christian Family Life (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1944), pp. 2 and 3.

26. E.P. Pfatteicher, "Christianity and the Home," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1934, VII, 3, p. 287.

27. Editorial, "Marriage Not Purely a Civil Contract," The Lutheran, March 23, 1922, IV, 25, pp. 16 and 17.

28. Editorial, "The Black Plague," The Lutheran, July 11, 1919, I, 10, p. 210.

29. Editorial, "Divorce and Remarriage," The Lutheran, October 7, 1920, III, 2, p. 17.

30. J. George Dorn, "Holy Writ Bearing on Marriage and Divorce," The Lutheran, August 22, 1929, XI, 47, p. 10.

31. Loc. cit.

32. P.W. Mueller, "The Teaching of Scripture on Divorce," The Lutheran Church Review, April, 1924, XLIII, 2, p. 171. See entire article in two issues: January, 1924, XLIII, 1, pp. 49-64; April, 1924, XLIII, 2, pp. 167-179.

33. Ibid., p. 179.

34. Raymond T. Stamm, "The New Testament and the Divorce Question," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, April, 1930, III, 2, pp. 193

and 194. See also a letter in The Lutheran concerning the then proposed action of the U.L.C.A. on divorce which pleaded that the spirit of love rather than of law be the guiding principle (October 4, 1928, XI, 1, p. 19).

35. At the 1952 convention of the U.L.C.A. in Seattle, the Board of Social Missions requested permission to re-study the action of the Church on marriage and divorce. It was ruled that this was within the province of the Board without special action. This study is now under way.

36. Gerhard E. Lenski, "The Church's Responsibility in Marriage," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1938, XI, 3, pp. 258 and 259.

37. Editorial, "Soviet Marriage Laws," The Lutheran, July 1, 1920, II, 9, p. 151.

38. Editorial, "Baptists on the Divorce Question," The Lutheran, July 15, 1920, II, 11, p. 184.

39. Emil E. Fischer, "Marriage and the Family in the United States," The Lutheran, May 30, 1929, XI, 35, p. 8.

40. Editorial, "Baptists on the Divorce Question," The Lutheran, July 15, 1920, II, 11, p. 184.

41. Loc. cit. See also editorial, "A United Front Against Divorce," The Lutheran, April 5, 1923, V, 27, p. 16.

42. Editorial, "Divorce Proceedings," The Lutheran, September 23, 1920, II, 21, p. 346.

43. Editorial, "A Crime Against Society," The Lutheran, February 9, 1922, IV, 19, pp. 16 and 17.

44. Editorial, "Why So Many Divorces?", The Lutheran, April 23, 1925, VII, 30, p. 15.

45. I. Searles Runyon, "Companionship and the Marriage Covenant," The Lutheran, August 18, 1927, IX, 46, p. 9.

46. Charles P. Cressman, "The Stabilization of Marriage and Family Life," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1946, XIX, 3, pp. 266 ff.

47. See George Dorn, "Some Aspects of Our Divorce Problem," The Lutheran, August 21, 1924, VI, 47, pp. 5 and 6; also Oscar Blackwelder, "Uniform Marriage and Divorce Laws," The Lutheran, February 5, 1947, XIX, 19, p. 11.

48. F.K. Kruger, "The Modern Family and the Divorce Problem" The Lutheran, June 26, 1924, VI, 39, pp. 5 ff.

49. "The Feminine Invasion," The Lutheran, March 25, 1920, I, 48, p. 944. See also editorial, "Training for Home Life," The Lutheran, December 5, 1918, XXIII, 10, p. 10.

50. F.H. Knubel, The Lutheran, April 2, 1931, XIII, 27, p. 15.

51. Fredrik Schiotz, "Pre-Marital Counseling," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, October, 1945, XVIII, 4, pp. 377 and 378.

52. Carl F. Reuss, Planned Parenthood (New York: Monograph published by the Division of Welfare, National Lutheran Council, n.d.), prepared for delivery at all regional meetings of the Lutheran Welfare Council.

CHAPTER XV

RACE RELATIONS

During the years occupied by this study, one of the problems that surged to the surface of the thinking of American society was that of race relations. There were several reasons for this. The doctrine of Aryan supremacy promulgated by the Nazis, and the suppression of minority groups based upon ethnic origin or religion caused everyone to be forced to rethink the meaning of race. The war with Asia, with Asiatics as both foe and ally, caused greater contact with people of other races and also caused the United States to become acutely aware of people of Asiatic origin within its own borders. The dislocations of war gave many Negroes, in particular, opportunities to participate in areas of work that had been denied them because of race. In addition, it helped accentuate the migration of Negro people from the south to northern and mid-western industrial areas.

In the stress of wartime, the United States broadcast to the world its democratic doctrines. Thus, it became increasingly difficult to deny those doctrines in practical application to citizens of the United States who happened to be of non-white origin. Preaching the doctrines of democracy on one hand, and denying them to non-whites on the other, produced what the Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal called, "The American Dilemma".[1] A persistent drive toward equal rights on the part of Negro citizens has heightened the race problem and has produced

such things as Supreme Court decisions concerning segregation, Fair Employment Practices Acts, and occasional race riots. Although the race problem is old, the result of the present day situation in which improved communication and transportation have caused increasing contacts among people of different ethnic origin, has been to establish this problem as one of the paramount social questions of the day.

Considering the fundamental importance of the problem of race, one is disappointed at the paucity of material found in U.L.C.A. literature. The Church in convention dealt with the subject hardly at all except in terms of mission work among Negroes. There are only a few scattered references to the question in the actions of Synods. The Lutheran Church Quarterly published only a few extended articles on the subject. Only The Lutheran carried a fair number of articles on the race problem. This can be explained, in part, by the traditional Lutheran attitude which has held up until recent years that such questions lay outside of the province of the Church. In addition, the U.L.C.A. was not directly affected by the race problem to a large degree. The U.L.C.A. did not have as many churches in the South as some other denominations, and the number of Negro members formed an almost unnoticed part of total U.L.C.A. membership. Also, up until recently the U.L.C.A. has been predominantly rural, and so escaped a great deal of contact with the race problem that has been aggravated by urban situations. These reasons are offered not by way of justification of the relative silence of the U.L.C.A. on a vital moral issue, but by way of partial explanation. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the interest of the entire Christian Church in America in the modern race problem has been of very

recent origin. Dr. Frank Loescher, in a study of Protestant practice in the race relations of seventeen large American denominations, has reported that from 1908 to 1929 these denominations adopted only six resolutions on the race question, but from 1940 to 1944 about one hundred were adopted.[2]

First of all, let us examine the references to the race problem both on the level of the U.L.C.A. and of its constituent Synods. The Minutes of the U.L.C.A. contain only two major references to the race or minority problem. The first of these deals with a ministry to Negroes in the South. A joint commission representing various Lutheran Church groups had been appointed and the following was recommended by the Executive Board for adoption by the U.L.C.A.:

> The purpose of all ministry to the colored race shall be to preach and teach the gospel of Christ in all truth and purity. Controversial differences, growing out of discussions and differences of viewpoint and opinion between Lutheran synodical bodies now extant, shall not be permitted to disturb such ministering to the colored race.
>
> .....
>
> In this long range program the goal shall be a self-supporting Lutheran Church among the Negroes with a competent and well-trained and adequately equipped colored ministry and diaconate, recruited from young Negroes who have enjoyed college and university training. To reach this goal, efforts shall be made to organize and build well-established Christian congregations, trained in self-government and self-support.
>
> The contribution of this joint effort to this program shall be supervision and temporary material assistance. What is best in Negro individuality and Negro culture shall be given every opportunity for expression.[3]

It is obvious from this, that the Church was side-stepping some of the basic issues connected with race relations, and that the approved pattern of work was to be that of a segregated Church.

The other reference in U.L.C.A. Minutes is to manifestation of anti-semitism[4] in our country. Upon recommendation of the Board of American Missions in 1944, the Church expressed its concern at the manifestations of anti-semitism in American life, and asked its members, "(1) to consider the Jewish brethren in the spirit of Luther who spoke kindly of them as 'the blood brothers of our Lord;' (2) to use every available means to assure the Jewish people of their communities of our Church's efforts for the preservation of their rights; and (3) to offer prayers in their behalf."[5]

Actions of the Synods on this subject are almost non-existent. Where they do exist, they are concerned mainly with the problem of extending the ministry of the Lutheran Church to minority groups. None of the official actions dealt with the basic issues of inter-racial relationships. The South Carolina Synod, for example, heard the report of a special committee to study the Negro question in 1922 to the effect that Lutherans cannot escape responsibility for working among Negroes in the South. "The greatest obstacles to successful work by Lutherans among negroes in South Carolina," it pointed out, "in common with other white workers, are found in political and social race relationships."[6] It was the feeling of the Committee that work must be done by Negro leaders and the best course the Church could follow would be in the training of such leaders. In 1945, this same Synod showed that it was still concerned with the problem, although in a somewhat broadened way, when its Department of Social Action reported that it was "studying the methods and approach to some of the inter-racial problems, discussing with other groups, white and colored, avenues of cooperative study and

aid. Better recreational facilities for colored children in cities, improved housing and sanitation in crowded districts for both white and colored, also studying conditions in industrial institutions."[7]

It can be seen, therefore, that the official Church simply did not deal with the problem of race relations at all. It is probable that because of differing sectional attitudes on certain basic questions such as segregation that the Church did not want to become embroiled in controversy. Yet it is evident by the end of the study period that the Church was beginning to get ready to face the problems that were involved. The Social Action Department produced a forthright statement at the December, 1946 meeting of the Board of Social Missions in which it stated:

> Racial discrimination is a perennial problem, but it is particularly acute in the aftermath of war. What is needed is a vigorous protesting against the unscientific and unchristian assignment of the Negro and other minority groups to a position of inferiority in society and the practice of discriminating against such in the matters of education, employment, wages, housing, welfare, medical care, recreation, rights and privileges as American citizens, and, on the other hand, their proper recognition requires the inculcation of Christian love, justice, truth, appreciation of the worth of human personality, and positive program of social adjustment which insures the rights and privileges obtaining in a true democracy. Since social problems, such as crime, delinquency, prostitution, venereal disease, and illegitimacy, are relatively high among minority groups largely by reason of conditions arising from discrimination made against them, it is incumbent upon society and particularly the Church to seek to awaken the public conscience to its responsibility to remove the barriers and to provide the opportunities insuring wholesome social life on the part of all groups.[8]

It was soon after this that the Board of Social Missions began working on a statement on race relations. Although a little preliminary work had been done at the time of the conclusion of this study, this statement had not yet been produced by the end of 1948.[9]

As we turn now to the periodical literature for a somewhat more extensive examination of attitudes existing within the U.L.C.A. on the problem of race relations, let us examine this with the following outline in mind:

1. Expression of basic attitudes toward the status of non-white races;
2. Arguments both for and against enforced segregation;
3. Conceptions of the duty of the Church with reference to the issue of race relations.

The basic source for expressions of attitudes on the status of non-white races is to be found in The Lutheran magazine. Throughout the years, this publication has opposed racial intolerance. It has dealt with the subject neither extensively nor profoundly, but in spite of that, it has maintained a stand that generally has called for the recognition of people as persons regardless of racial background. The part that white people played in race riots shortly after the first World War was deplored. Pointing out that this was a national problem, and not simply one confined to the South, it pleaded for patience and fair treatment on the part of white people. "Where two parties are involved in a contract," it stated, "one party cannot be ignored or unfairly treated to the advantage of the other party. No doubt the Negro needs education, and civilizing and christianizing influences. This takes time and patience. Therefore, when a Negro does commit a wrong, those who know better should not instantly rush to jungle and brute force methods...."[10]

The Rev. B.S. Brown asserted that we need to have a concern for the religious status of the Negro. Pointing out that there is a great

deal of cloudy thinking on the whole subject of race, the author states that two things are certain, namely, "the likeness of the Maker belongs to Negroes as truly as to others; so they are as surely worth being saved. Also, by nature they are sinful, as are we; so they, as well as we, are in need of salvation."[11] The reaction to a book, The Rising Tide of Color, by Lathrop Stoddard, which gained wide circulation in the early 1920's, was a moving article that called upon people in the name of Christ to oppose such theories of racial inequality as are advanced by Stoddard. The book is called vicious because of its pretense at being science and philosophy, and

> because under real and supposed dangers, brought into existence by the white man's injustice, it seeks to inculcate a still more determined race hatred.... It lays hold of the passion of race far stronger than of nation, and in place of the Christian principle of human brotherhood would organize the world into two hostile camps and marshal them for the most awful conflict of the ages. Under the pretense that equality before the law necessitates equality at our family altars, he would array the white man against the men of color in all the economic relations of life.... It is a Christless method and devilish. It spells ruin.[12]

This author then, after asking what church members are going to do about the situation, indicates hiw own attitude stating that he has taken his stand "... not as a gladiator challenging others to battle, but as an ambassador of the Christ whose cross was borne by a black man to Calvary's height and who shed His blood, that men of all races, kindred and tongues might love and serve, and not hate and destroy each other." Moreover, he states his conviction that unless we inculcate the love of Christ for the rising tide of color, we face another fratricidal conflict like the Civil War.[13]

One jarring note in the matter of race relations is found in an

article in The Lutheran in 1936 which bears the explanatory title: "The Editor of The Lutheran Describes His Personal Reaction to the Claims of the Negro for Participation in Church and National Benefits." The sociological situation seems to have borne heavily upon the thinking of the editor in this matter. While recognizing the fact that individual Negroes have the ability to rise to any heights reached by people of other races, he is much more dubious about the ability of the race as a whole. Due to his observations in "The Black Belt of Philadelphia," he came to the personal conclusion "that any claim of racial equality in culture and ability can be substantiated only by obscuring the average situation."[14] Although, in an editorial in the following year, traces of a lingering doubt are still found, the effects of the sociological situation upon the Negroes are more clearly recognized. Stating that "Lutherans believe as a matter accepted beyond argument color and race are attributes of the bodily and not of the spiritual nature of man,..." he states that "it is the Christian citizen who must study conditions and learn how to overcome improper and unjust discriminations," and that "the white citizen has for his plain duty the insistence that the laws of the land shall not bear inequitably on the black citizen...."[15] It was the thinking of this writer that equality of opportunity in the areas of education and employment would provide the most distinct gains.

The rise of pseudo-scientific theories of race in Nazi Germany occasioned comment in The Lutheran. One article by Paul Morentz pointed out that there is no biblical basis for anti-semitism, in fact, Scripture opposes such an idea.[16] Another by E.E. Flack stated that narrow theories of racism ran head-on into Christian thinking.[17] Still another,

deplored the racism that was evident in our own country as a denial of "the fundamental doctrines of our Declaration of Indenpendence." "Christians have a special responsibility in this situation," stated Dr. Seebach. "Racism has no place in the thoughts and practices of those who have accepted the Master's program for all humanity."[18]

The evacuation of American citizens of Japanese descent from the west coast shortly after Pearl Harbor is now generally acknowledged to have had a basis in race hysteria, since no other group of enemy aliens was thus treated. There is only one brief reference to this in The Lutheran and its spirit is in opposition to this action. It approved protests to the government on the part of white citizens. "It is consistent with the Gospel's lessons on fellowship before God," stated the article, "that civil authorities should be cautioned and warned of a day when their acts will be subjected to scrutiny."[19]

It can be stated categorically that all of the expressions of opinion in U.L.C.A. literature were to the effect that all races have spiritual equality. Moreover, there was intense opposition to any theories which would relegate any race to an inferior position in this regard. The question now remains as to how far Lutheran writers were willing to extend spiritual equality into other areas of life, namely, political, economic, educational and social. Although expressions of opinion on this are few, it is the unanimous opinion of all published articles that equality of opportunity shall be given to all races in all realms - with a single exception. This general principle is qualified only by the issue of segregation with which we shall deal in a moment.

We have previously mentioned a statement in The Lutheran that asked for educational and economic opportunity for the Negro. At an earlier date, this same source had stated that "the Negro has as much right to political recognition as the white man of American birth or the American citizen by naturalization. Under our system of government no man should be denied political equality excepting through cause, and color alone cannot disenfranchize a man."[20]

Although agreeing in principle with ideas of equality of opportunity in these various spheres, there is practically no discussion of practical measures by which such equality of opportunity could be afforded to all races within our society. While the so called "Fair Employment Practices Bill" (S.101) was being discussed in the Senate, Dr. Blackwelder devoted a column in The Lutheran to analyze it. Although he declared himself totally in favor of the principles behind the bill - ("with the statements of purpose in this bill no man with a Christian conscience can object"), he doubted the wisdom of its passage because it would be virtually unenforceable: "This bill... would bring a system of spying, witch-hunting, inuendo, slander that will make the effort to enforce the Prohibition Amendment seem like child's play."[21]

As has already been indicated, although all writers both North and South, agreed that non-white people should have equality of opportunity in so far as education, employment, politics and religion are concerned, one of the basic differences of opinion was as to whether or not that should be accomplished within the pattern of segregation. Actually, since the U.L.C.A. until very recent years has virtually by-passed the race problem, it is to be expected that anything written on the basic

issue of segregation would be of very recent origin.

Within recent years, it has been the announced policy of the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A. to assist in the development of bi-racial congregations in areas that in themselves are bi-racial. Publicity was given to one such congregation in The Lutheran.[22] This report brought forth a vigorous protest by a southern pastor who stated that such a thing as reported in The Lutheran could not happen in the Churches south of the Mason Dixon Line but asserted that that did not mean that the South was less Christian in race relations. The article is rather confused in its thinking. It upholds the pattern of segregation, and yet seems to indicate appreciation of the fact that the walls of segregation are slowly crumbling. It states that the Negro should have equality of opportunity politically and economically, but then further asserts that the Negro does not have the capability of exercising this equality. "Southern Christians", wrote the author, "believe, with other Christians, in the equality of the Negro. They think the Negro should have equal rights and privileges as a human being, as a child of God, and as a citizen of the U.S.A. He along with all Americans should have the right to vote, to receive fair wages according to the quality and quantity of his work, and to receive justice in the courts. They further believe that the Negro has equal access to God, for God is no respector of persons. His soul is as precious to God as any white man's. These beliefs are the same as held by all true Christians."[23] In spite of this, it is the feeling of the author that the Negro is simply not qualified to vote nor to receive higher wages than he does.

Segregation is defended on the basis that "social relationships are not a matter of a right but a matter of personal choice. It is not a matter of equality but a matter with whom we wish to associate and live with."[24] Moreover, the author defends the benevolence of the white person toward the colored person as being an example of true Christian brotherliness.[25] In spite of all of this, he points out that "segregation is gradually being broken down in Christian circles as a prelude to its total breakdown. Here and there in the South ministerial associations are becoming bi-racial and both races come together for special occasions. Today this is an exception to the rule, but in the not too distant future it will be the general rule."[26] Thus, the tone at the end of the article is different from that at the beginning. The immediate reaction of the author was to declare that such a thing as a bi-racial congregation was unthinkable. His later conclusion seems to be that the peril lies in trying to hasten the process.

The Rev. Wynne C. Boliek also upheld the idea of equality for all races, but asserted that this would be best accomplished within the framework of segregation. It was his opinion that the South has been able to make greater advances under legal segregation than other parts of the nation without it. To him, segregation simply applied to social behavior. "In an opinion handed down some months ago," he wrote,

> in a court case involving a race problem, Judge Lawrence F. Speckman[27] ... made a clear distinction between "political" and "social" rights. Under the Constitution of the United States, any and all citizens have political rights which include voting and other citizenship privileges. These cannot be denied them. But social rights come under an entirely different category. For example, segregation is practiced <u>within</u> races as well as <u>between</u> races in all parts of the U.S. Segregation is <u>constitutional</u>. Certain groups of white people will not admit other white people

into their social fellowship. The same is true within the negro and other races.[28]

An increasing number of writers in the U.L.C.A. have been demanding that an end be put to all racial intolerance, and some of them have been including segregation under that heading. "It is high time that the United Lutheran Church," wrote one, "address itself to a program of putting an end to conditions and attitudes toward Negroes that are incompatible with Christian teachings...."[29]

There were several reactions to the article published by the southern pastor on the subject of whether or not the South was less Christian in race relations. One by Dr. Dwight Putman agrees with his fellow pastor in the South that the North is just as unchristian in race relations as the South, and has no right to be pointing a finger of scorn at any part of the country. Point by point, he then seeks to demolish the arguments that were presented. It is his belief that the southern pastor is far too complacent about the progress that has been made under the pattern of segregation.[30]

The editor of The Lutheran also took issue with this article, not pointing a finger at the South, since he admitted that "when it comes to breaking down segregation, they have a much older and tougher problem than we have in the North."[31] He felt, however, that in the North Christians could do a great deal at eliminating segregation generally by beginning in their own churches. "If we Christians," he wrote, "want to be keenly alive to the changing conditions of the world, we could get some practice by tackling immediately this question of race. There has already been a lot of talk among us, but not much action.

Our churches would experience a new sense of power in meeting modern situations if we would all start looking around to see if there were any Negroes who might like to join our churches."[32]

Dr. Blackwelder reported on a study by the Council of Social Agencies of Washington D.C. which stated that racial segregation is inconsistent with Christian principles. While believing thoroughly in this, he counseled a lack of haste. "I believe it takes time and the evolutionary process," he said, "to effect the changes the Council of Social Agencies proposes. To follow their lead arbitrarily would do more harm than good. There are old churches in Washington which would be torn apart by non-segregation. That is'nt building the Kingdom.... My suggestion is that mission boards establish at least one inter-racial church in each large city."[33]

All of the references made in The Lutheran to the race question in recent years have been in terms of opposition to segregation on the grounds that enforced segregation is unchristian. A report was made of an attempt to secure repeal of Maryland's Jim Crow law in 1947 which was led by a Lutheran clergyman.[34] The segregation in Washington D.C. which necessitated the cancelling of a trip of white and Negro school children from New York City to the nation's capitol was deplored. The conviction was expressed "that when Negroes have real opportunity they become fully as competent and admirable as most white people," and so asked church people to be thoroughly Christian in their attitudes.[36] A final one emphasized what is being heard, and applied to the question of race, with increasing frequency within the U.L.C.A.:

> Christianity in practice means one person getting along well with another: people within the family, within

> the nation, across national boundaries. We must hear the words of the New Testament: There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.
>
> A test of our sincerity as Christians is our willingness to try to overcome the very human reluctance to include all men in our definition of brotherhood. As long as there is conspicuous evidence of our failure in this direction, we Christians must remind one another of this shortcoming. Our faith really proves itself when it impels us to do things that are against the grain of our human nature. Let's not let ourselves off too easily on difficult assignments.[37]

With reference to the question of segregation, therefore, it can be seen that southern Christians have tended to defend it as the best possible arrangement for both races under which they might work for equality of rights and opportunities. Even this, however, is not defended as a necessary ultimate arrangement. In opposition to this, there is discernible a ground swell of opinion in the direction that segregation, when it is enforced by law or custom and not simply a voluntary thing, will defeat all attempts to secure equality of rights and opportunities among the races. There is an increasing feeling that the Church, in her own worship and service, must begin to break down the barriers of segregation. While it is impossible to draw conclusions for the whole Church from the limited discussions that have appeared in print, it can be said that the climate of the Church's thinking is such that those who uphold the theory of segregation are on the defensive.

Not much thought has been given in the U.L.C.A. as to the duty of the Church with reference to the race problem. Those who wrote at all on the subject did realize the importance of religion as a means of overcoming race prejudice. Dr. George Drach admitted that the white race is far in front in modern life in such things as science,

inventions and political power. This superiority, however, was not based on race. Moreover, it was a duty to use such advantage for service, not for attempting to keep other races in servitude.[38] Summing up what he felt were the teachings of the Bible on race, he wrote:

> I must recognize, respect and do all I can to restore the image of God in every human being.
> I must not make invidious distinctions between fellow human beings on the basis of race differences.
> I must not deliberately hold in contempt any man because he happens to belong to another race other than my own.
> I must be guided by Jesus' law of love and service in all human affairs.
> I must do all I can to preach His gospel to all nations and teach whatsoever He has commanded.[39]

The editor of The Lutheran in 1925 recognized the race problem as one of the greatest facing our society. Although admitting the necessity of education, he felt that this was not sufficient since the root cause of racial difficulties was to be found in sin. Consequently, conversion to Christ had to precede all other attempts to solve the problem of race.[40]

At another time, The Lutheran commented on the gains that were being made in extending opportunities and privileges to the non-white races of the country. A great deal of this was attributed to the impulses of religion. "The gradual extension," the editor wrote, "of advantages to the negro by the white has the support of economic and civic justice but the only command that is beyond question is the command of Christ."[41]

The Rev. Charles Venable pointed out the deep roots of racial difficulties and concluded that because of this religion is extremely

important in race relations. "Not only," he said, "does religion have a creed and a set of teachings which counter all race discrimination and prejudice but religion has a technique of attack which gets at the race problem at a deeper level than the rational."[42]

It will be noted from these few references that there was a feeling that religion must play a definite role in the solution of the problem of race relations. Actually, however, the function of the Church in this matter was hardly discussed at all, except by implication that the Church should be about its business of making better Christians. By way of summary, it can be stated that the U.L.C.A. during the years of this study, took no official stand on the matter of race relations. The subject hardly appears at all in the Minutes of the general body or of synodical conventions although there are a few references that express a concern that religious work should be done among Negroes. In 1948, however, the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A. was working on a proposed statement on race relations. There is also other evidence that the Church is becoming more acutely aware of its responsibility in this entire matter.

The periodical literature of the Church does contain references to this question. This was particularly stimulated by the outbreak of race riots in large cities, the rise of racial theories in Nazi Germany, and more recently the drive for legal and social equality on the part of American Negroes. Almost all of these articles consistently point to the fact that Christianity demands a recognition of the equality of all people without reference to race. There is no doubt about the general stand of all of the published articles within the U.L.C.A.

Christianity stands forever at odds with ideas of racial intolerance or theories of racism.

Segregation in society generally, and particularly within the Church, has come under sharp criticism within recent years. There are protests on this point from southern churchmen, but even though they hold to the desirability of segregation, all of them have expressed themselves as desiring an advance in every area of life for the Negro. The idea of "separate but equal" appeals most to them. The expressed position of the periodical literature of the U.L.C.A. over the years, however, is that of recognition of the Negro[43] as a child of God, and as worthy of all rights and privileges and responsibilities that the white man possesses. There is no question but that the U.L.C.A. is moving in the direction of a greater knowledge and consciousness of this entire matter, of a firmer reenforcement of its position of the equality of the races, and of an attempt to effect a social implementation of these principles. The matter of segregation in the Church itself is one of the supreme tests of the sincerity of the Church. Although up until now, there are only a few congregations that can be called bi-racial, there is the deliberate attempt to seek to make qualifications in any Lutheran Church those of faith and character and not of race.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter XV Race Relations

1. Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper, 1944), Two Volumes. For the author's own explanation of the title, see I, p. xliii.

2. Frank S. Loescher, The Protestant Church and the Negro (New York: Association Press, 1948). See Chapter II, esp. pp. 28-38.

3. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1940, p. 65.

4. Strictly speaking, of course, anti-semitism does not come under the heading of race relations. Yet attitudes expressed in this regard are so closely connected with the basic issues of race relations that we have included this subject here.

5. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1944, p. 168.

6. Minutes, South Carolina Synod, 1922, p. 61.

7. Minutes, South Carolina Synod, 1945, p. 95.

8. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., December 12, 1946, Vol. IV, p. 15.

9. A "Statement on Human Relations" was adopted jointly by the Board of Social Missions and the Executive Board in 1951. For the full text see Appendix C. This statement was generally well received by the Church although it did produce a minor but vociferous protest on the part of a few congregations and individuals in the South, mainly because of its stand against enforced segregation.

10. Editorial, "A National Problem" The Lutheran, August 14, 1919, I, 16, p. 312. See also comments on the reaction of other countries to race riots in the U.S.: August 21, 1919, I, 17, p. 335.

11. B.S. Brown, "Co-operation to Christianize Colored Citizens," The Lutheran, January 8, 1920, I, 37, p. 738.

12. J.C. Kunzmann, "The Christianity of America Dare Not Fail," The Lutheran, January 7, 1927, VIII, 15, p. 9.

13. Loc. cit.

14. The Lutheran, July 9, 1936, XVIII, 41, p. 11.

15. "Race Relations," The Lutheran, February 4, 1937, XIX, 19, p. 14.

16. Paul Morentz, "In a Race - Conscious Age," The Lutheran, September 1, 1937, XIX, 49, pp. 6 and 7.

17. E.E. Flack, "Race Culture Narrowing," The Lutheran, October 13, 1937, XX, 2, p. 11. The message from the Oxford Conference dealing in part with a condemnation of racial pride was published in The Lutheran, August 18, 1937, XIX, 47, pp. 2 and 21.

18. Julius Seebach, The Lutheran, February 23, 1944, XXVI, 21, p. 5.

19. Editorial, "Japanese - Americans Evacuated," The Lutheran, August 26, 1942, XXIV, 48, p. 14.

20. Editorial, "What Does the American Negro Want?", The Lutheran, October 9, 1919, I, 24, p. 473.

21. The Lutheran, February 20, 1946, XXVIII, 21, p. 11.

22. Marianne DeGraff, "No Color Line," The Lutheran, May 15, 1946, XXVIII, 33, pp. 21 f. There are only a few such congregations, all in the New York area.

23. John R. Brokhoff, "Is the South Less Christian in Race Relations?", The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1947, XX, 3, p. 249. See entire article, pp. 247 ff.

24. Loc. cit.

25. Loc. cit.

26. Ibid., p. 252.

27. Who is currently a member of the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A.

28. Wynne C. Bolick, "Race Problem in the South," The Lutheran, September 29, 1948, XXX, 53, p. 15. See entire article, pp. 13 ff.

29. Malcolm A. Jackson, "The Negro and the United Lutheran Church," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, October, 1940, XIII, 4, p. 416.

30. Dwight Putman, "How Christian is the North in Race Relations?", The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1947, XX, 3, pp. 258 ff.

31. The Lutheran, April 16, 1947, XXIX, 29, p. 50.

32. Loc. cit.

33. Oscar Blackwelder, "Segregation in Churches," The Lutheran, October 9, 1946, XXIX, 2, p. 10. For another report on this subject see Robert Van Deusen, "Washington Social Survey," The Lutheran, March 19, 1947, XXIX, 25, p. 12. For an early report and reaction on segregation in Washington, see The Lutheran, April 10, 1924, VI, 28, p. 24.

34. The Lutheran, April 2, 1947, XXIX, 27, p. 8.

35. The Lutheran, May 26, 1948, XXX, 35, p. 50.

36. The Lutheran, July 28, 1948, XXX, 44, p. 50.

37. The Lutheran, September 29, 1948, XXX, 53, p. 50.

38. George Drach, "The Bible's Teaching About Race Relations," The Lutheran, December 29, 1927, X, 13, p. 7.

39. Loc. cit.

40. "The Greatest Problem" The Lutheran, July 30, 1925, VII, 44, p. 15.

41. Editorial, "A Minority Situation," The Lutheran, February 20, 1936, XVIII, 21, p. 15.

42. Charles L. Venable, "The Root of the Race Question," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1945, XVIII, 3, p. 299.

43. We have confined this statement to Negro-white relationships because almost all the discussion is on that basis. Other races can be included, of course, by implication as well as by a few direct statements.

CHAPTER XVI

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND PROHIBITION

One of the questions of public interest that occasioned a tremendous amount of discussion, particularly in the 1920's and 1930's, was that of national prohibition. The activity of many Protestant church groups in securing this legislation is well known. The United Lutheran Church came into being at about the same time that the 18th Amendment to the Constitution was passed. From the very beginning, this Amendment was under constant attack in many segments of American society. This opposition continued until 1933, at which time the Prohibition Amendment was repealed.

What was the attitude of the U.L.C.A. during this period of controversy? It cannot be said that the Lutheran Church had been in the forefront of church activity in the matter of securing this legislation. This was partly due to the reticence of the Lutheran Church to engage in matters of public interest, and partly to the fact that the U.L.C.A., in particular, arose out of a European tradition in which the use of alcoholic beverages was an accepted part of the culture. In spite of this, segments of the Lutheran Church which were to make up the U.L.C.A. vigorously promoted efforts to crystallize public opinion for national prohibition. For example, in the last meeting of the General Synod which was held in conjunction with the organizing convention of the U.L.C.A., the standing Temperance Committee reported that

it was a certainty that the 18th Amendment to the Constitution would be ratified by the states. It then continued as follows:

> For this and all the great victories over the organized and nefarious liquor traffic we give devout thanks to the great Head of the Church, Who has beyond question providentially led and helped us in the great contest. Our Church of the General Synod has ever been found on the right side, and by her ministers and laymen has actively and practically assisted in achieving this most significant victory of moral reform of all time.
>
> A great work lies before the people of the country in encouraging officials in the proper enforcement of the law and in developing and maintaining a public sentiment among our own people and the community at large which will cooperate in making the law as effective and helpful as it is designed to be. Besides this we should be interested and also participants in the effort to extend the blessings of temperance and abstinence throughout the world.[1]

The data concerning the attitude of the U.L.C.A. toward the use of alcoholic beverages and toward the national prohibition amendment must be analyzed carefully or a false impression can easily be gained from the published material. On the one hand, references to support for complete abstinence and for federal legislation to prohibit the sale and manufacture of alcoholic beverages are rather voluminous. On the other hand, there is almost a complete absence of published material supporting the position that the use of alcoholic beverages even in moderation is good, or inopposition to national prohibition. Yet it may be that silence is more eloquent in giving us the true attitude of the U.L.C.A. on this question than many published articles. When the data is examined, it becomes apparent that the conventions of the U.L.C.A. made statements related to this subject only infrequently and with reticence. In addition, the theological journals of the Church were completely silent. Two sources, however, gave thorough-going

support to prohibition. One of these was The Lutheran magazine. The other was the actions of many constituent Synods of the U.L.C.A.

The situation seems to have been that there was a strong element in the U.L.C.A. which considered the use of alcoholic beverages as a moral issue and national prohibition as a good way to deal with this issue. But there was another strong element which felt that while the abuse of alcoholic beverages was definitely an evil, their use in moderation was not. Consequently, in this group there was little support for national prohibition, or, support was given largely on the ground that as good citizens we should obey the law.

Since the latter group was running counter to one of the moral enthusiasms of the day, it tended to take refuge in silence and thus published little by way of support of its position. Yet it was strong enough to prevent the conventions of the U.L.C.A. from taking many actions on the matter of the use of alcoholic beverages, and particularly from having the Church define this as a moral issue except in terms of obedience to law. The few actions which the U.L.C.A. did take were almost always preceded by extended and vigorous debate indicating the lack of unanimity of thinking.

Thus, although there are frequent declarations of support both for abstinence and prohibition, the two main sources of these must be examined carefully. The editorial policy of The Lutheran which was in general in support of abstinence and prohibition, seems to have been determined in large measure by a crusading editor who had an important segment of the Church behind him, but who frequently complained at the lack of support on these matters by another large part of the Church.

Likewise, even though there are rather voluminous declarations of support for abstinence and prohibition on the part of the Synods, less than half of the constituent Synods of the U.L.C.A. said anything at all on the subject. In addition, it is discovered that at least three-fifths of the references come from Synods in the state of Pennsylvania which had formerly belonged to the General Synod. This predecessor body of the U.L.C.A. had been active in the movement leading up to national prohibition. It is significant that the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, the oldest and largest of the U.L.C.A. Synods, which was of General Council background, was completely silent on this subject.

Thus, while we must not minimize the strong support for abstinence and prohibition that existed within the U.L.C.A. even to the extent of guiding the editorial policy of the official church paper, we must also be careful not to suppose that this represented the attitude of the whole Church. Because of the paucity of actions by the U.L.C.A. (even taking into account its traditional reluctance to take action on such subjects), it can even be questioned whether this represented the dominant attitude of the Church.

With this explanation as a background, let us now examine the actions of the U.L.C.A. in convention and then turn to the arguments in support of abstinence and prohibition given by many of the Synods and <u>The Lutheran</u> magazine. The arguments in the latter two sources, while frequently given, are repetitious and will be examined according to the following outline:

1. During Prohibition: 1918-1933

    a. Declarations of support for abstinence or national

prohibition and the reasons given for such support.

b. Statements deploring the lukewarmness of the Church in this regard and the call for increased education.

c. The calls for better law enforcement and examples of the Church's endorsing the government and specific legislation.

2. After Repeal: 1933-1948

a. Pointing out the evils of repeal.

b. Suggested solutions.

Each source will be examined individually according to this pattern.

During the entire life of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, there is no record of any action taken by the U.L.C.A. with reference to the use of alcoholic beverages or to the Prohibition Law. In the negotiations leading up to the formation of the U.L.C.A., the General Synod recommended that the U.L.C.A. have a standing committee on temperance. This recommendation was adopted, but in a few years this committee was merged in the broader interest of the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare. At the very first convention of the Church an attempt was made to establish the attitude of the Church toward pending legislation on controlling the use of alcoholic beverages. A resolution was offered to the effect "that the United Lutheran Church in America put itself on record favoring temperance legislation, looking toward the elimination of the liquor traffic with the hope and prayer that the National Prohibition Amendment may carry in the state legislatures and become effective in our nation."[2] The convention sidestepped this issue, however, by referring it to the temperance committee after which nothing more was heard about it.

The repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment did cause the Church to adopt the following resolution on temperance in 1934:

> (a) That the United Lutheran Church in America oppose the insidious evils and dangers of the liquor traffic, and call upon its pastors and people to be vigilant in combating the same.
> (b) That the United Lutheran Church in America authorize the Inner Mission Board to prepare suitable educational literature for the instruction and guidance of the members of the Church in temperance in all things, and request the Board of Publication to publish the same.
> (c) That the United Lutheran Church in America call upon all its educational agencies to cooperate in this matter of temperance education.[3]

This resolution was adopted only after extended debate and after having been referred back to the Inner Mission Board for reformulation.

In response to this directive of the Church, the Inner Mission Board reported in 1936 on its efforts in the direction of temperance education in the Church. It mentioned the printing and the distribution of 10,000 copies of a pamphlet by Dr. W.H. Greever on, "The Bible Speaks on the Liquor Problem." This pamphlet spoke of what the Bible teaching on the subject was, the responsibility of the Church, and the responsibility of the State. Furthermore, the Board conducted an essay contest among the young people of the Church on the subject, "Why I Believe in Temperance." The winning essay, written by Alfred L. Beck was published in The Lutheran[4] and was printed in pamphlet form to the extent of 50,000 copies.[5] While ostensibly on temperance, the whole point of this essay was to support abstinence.

At the following convention the Board of Inner Missions reported that it was continuing its interest in the use of alcoholic beverages. It reported that it had under consideration the publication of additional

pamphlets on temperance. "...Spiritual forces," it stated, "must be applied not only to the cure but to the prevention of these evils. No mere condemnation of the evil is sufficient. Pronouncements against the liquor and drug traffic are in themselves futile. The Church, the Synods and most of all the congregation must strive by educational and by spiritual aims and methods to eradicate the evils of the liquor traffic...."[6]

The Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A. has maintained an interest, even though it has not been given extensive expression, in the social evils arising from the abuse of alcoholic beverages. The Social Action Department reported to a regular meeting of the Board that "the liquor evil is a perennial problem... It is an evil that must be fought incessantly.... It cannot be adequately met by law, though there must be liquor legislation. It is only through education and the motivation of life by the Gospel that proper controls can be maintained.... The Church needs to provide careful instruction in matters of temperance."[7]

This same report stressed the importance of research centers for securing adequate data on the use of alcoholic beverages. As a result of this, one of the activities of the Board of Social Missions within recent years has been to provide scholarships for people to attend the Yale Institute on Alcohol Studies. Findings of this group have been published in church periodicals.

In 1948 the Board of Social Missions urged the Church "to be more active in promoting education... in the scientifically demonstrated effects of the use of beverage alcohol," and " to cooperate in approved and tested methods of rehabilitating those who have become the

unfortunate victims of beverage alcohol."[8] Another resolution, which caused extended discussion, was presented asking the U.L.C.A. to urge its members "to give consideration to the effects of their own use of alcoholic beverages, even in moderation, in their own lives and on those less disciplined than themselves." After extended debate, this was finally adopted in a revised form reading: "to give consideration to the effects of the use of alcoholic beverages in their own lives and in the lives of others."[9] Significantly, the words "even in moderation" were omitted from the final revision.

Although the U.L.C.A. did officially recognize the evils of the abuse of alcoholic beverages and the evils of the liquor traffic, at no time throughout its history did it define the moderate use of alcoholic beverages as a thing which was in itself immoral; nor did it at any time take any action that was related directly to the national prohibition law, except to state that Christian citizens should uphold the law.

As we have already indicated, many of the Synods were far less restrained in their attitude toward this question than was the general church body. Let us now, therefore, concern ourselves with expressions of attitude that were made while National Prohibition was the law of the land. A great many declarations are to be found supporting both personal abstinence and National Prohibition. The reasons given for this support fall into three classifications: some felt that the use of alcoholic beverages was a grave moral issue; others argued that personal abstinence should be the rule and prohibition should be supported because it was the law of the land and as good citizens we should support the law; still

others felt that personal abstinence and national prohibition were good things largely on the basis of a concern for weaker brethren.

In order to capture the crusading spirit that possessed some of the Synods, it is necessary to note the language of the resolutions and reports. Obviously influenced by issues in the first World War, the Kansas Synod received the following ringing report:

> The increasing war against alcoholic autocracy will continue. The hosts of temperance are led by intrepid God-fearing men and women, supported by an ever increasing army whose morale is ever growing stronger. No mercy will be asked of the foe; no quarter will be given. An armistice will not be sought or signed. The ultimate goal is the destruction of the Kaiserism of Liquor. Old King Alcohol who has flung out defiance for generations, must be dethroned. His crown must crumble in the dust with the dishonored crowns of civil tyrants.[10]

In the following year, with prohibition an established fact, the Temperance Committee of the West Virginia Synod expressed its happiness over the establishment of prohibition of the liquor traffic and stated that "special thanks to the Lord God for this great triumph and victory should be given."[11]

Declarations for support of the Prohibition Amendment or for the temperance cause on the part of many of the Synods were frequent. Since they are generally repetitious, we shall not try to elaborate on them here. They vary in tone from the examples we have given above to the simple statements of fact. Almost all of them deplored the forces in the nation that were at work against prohibition.[12]

Furthermore, the morality of prohibition was the concern of some of the Synods. One, for example, declared the Prohibition Law "the greatest moral victory ever won by the forces of righteousness, in

modern history."[13] Another declared strong drink a curse and an evil and asked that "no Christian should compromise his influence by the use of alcoholic beverages however mild, but rather... he should use his influence against them."[14] "The position of the Church of Christ," stated another, "upon this great moral question should be reflected in its teaching, and its life. Temperance... should be emphasized in its program."[15]

While discussions of the morality of the use of alcoholic beverages were limited, there was widespread discussion concerning the violation of the law of the land. Over and over again members of the Church were counselled that whatever their feelings were as to the use of alcoholic beverages, violation of the law involved them in grave moral risks. "Our major moral issue, nationally," stated the Committee on Social Reform of the Ohio Synod, "is the matter of law enforcement, especially as it effects the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment.... As Lutherans we do not believe in the spiritual value of legal righteousness. Much of our lawlessness is undoubtedly the result of mistaken legislation and too much of it. But we do believe in good citizenship and good citizenship demands obedience to all laws. The complacency of our citizens in the face of law-breaking today with its degrading effect upon the coming generation constitutes a real menace to Church and State alike."[16] "The Eighteenth Amendment," wrote the Committee of another Synod, "is part of our Constitution. As such it is law. To violate it is criminal."[17] Many of the Synods, of course, called for observance of the law because they believed that a moral issue was involved in the actual use of alcoholic beverages. Others, however, held to the

principle that whether or not the use of alcoholic beverages involved a moral principle, the fact that there was a law against such use meant that all citizens should give obedience to the law purely on the basis of the duty they owed the State as citizens.[18] Without rendering any moral judgment whatsoever on the use of alcoholic beverages, for example, the Committee on Moral Issues of the New York Synod recommended that "Whereas, our government is bending every effort to enforce the Eighteenth Amendment to our National Constitution, we urge all good citizens to cooperate."[19] The argument of consideration for weaker brethren was also heard occasionally as a reason for supporting both abstinence and national prohibition. One Synod reminded its members that Luther's Small Catechism tells us that one of the ways by which the fifth commandment is broken is "by influencing others to form habits that ruin health and shorten life."[20]

Occasional regret was expressed at the lukewarmness of the churches in supporting the temperance cause.[21] True to Lutheran tradition, most of the Synods felt that legislation alone could not be depended upon to bring about moral reform, but that there must be a constant stress upon the Gospel and upon education.[22] "Sin dies hard," stated a committee of the Ohio Synod in 1926. "Years of education were required to arrive at the legislation state and years more will be required, no doubt, to effect a really worthwhile settlement of this issue."[23] Reaffirming its faith in the cause of temperance, the West Pennsylvania Synod urged "an educational program to conserve the present gains and to achieve the happy consummation of making 'this noble experiment' a glorious reality. We must not forget," it pointed out, "that the

Eighteenth Amendment was a result of long years of education, nor can we deny that since its enactment that program has been largely abandoned with serious results...."[24] Another Synod was reminded that even where the law was powerless to effect a solution to the matter of temperance, the Gospel provided both motivation and power.[25]

Over and over again the Synods called upon the government for better enforcement of the prohibition law and upon its own members for better cooperation with the government in this regard. Actually, in the matter of national prohibition there are more references to contacting the government than there are concerning any other social problem. Moreover, there is a greater cooperation by the Church with non-ecclesiastical agencies in the cause of temperance than there is with reference to any other social problem. A number of Synods had official representatives to the Anti-Saloon League.

The Central Pennsylvania Synod placed itself on record as being "in favor of enforcing the statutory laws against the illegal traffic in alcoholic liquors..."[26] The East Pennsylvania Synod recommended that its "pastors and lay delegates use every means consistent with their offices in the Church to elect a Congress which will preserve the Volstead Act, and provide any legislation needed for its further enforcement."[27] A year later this Synod resolved that "Christian citizens be urged to support by their suffrage only those candidates committed to the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment."[28] The Maryland Synod officially endorsed the stand of President Warren G. Harding concerning the enforcement of the Eighteenth Amendment.[29] The Pittsburgh Synod commended the District Enforcement Officer for his

"honest endeavor to enforce the 18th Amendment..." and promised him not only moral support but also "such other support as he may need."[30] The Illinois Synod commended the governor of that state for vetoing a bill which would have repealed the prohibition laws of Illinois.[31] In 1933 the Susquehanna Synod urged "that pastors and laymen support the State organization to prevent the repeal of the 18th Amendment."[32] In the same year the Alleghany Synod resolved that it would "cooperate with all other dry forces in the state to secure the election of delegates to state convention who are pledged against the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment."[33]

In summation, it may be stated that of the Synods which expressed themselves on the subject at all there was during the lifetime of the prohibition law a sincere belief in the beneficial impact of that law upon society. Although reasons for supporting this law differed somewhat, there were many such expressions of support. While there is a recognition of the need for education, there is a greater emphasis upon legislation in this matter than is characteristic of the U.L.C.A. with reference to any other social issue.

Everything that has been pointed out concerning the stand the Synods took in connection with abstinence and national prohibition can also be said without qualification of the articles and editorials which appeared in The Lutheran during the period 1918 to 1933. The editorial policy of The Lutheran placed that periodical definitely on the side of prohibition. At times editorial comment was provided with almost evangelistic zeal. Before the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution was passed, the editor looked forward happily to the fact of the State's

using the power of its might to enforce abstinence. "When men become weaklings and fools," he wrote, "the State has a right to say 'Stop fooling.' The wreckage which the drink evil has wrought defies calculation...."[34] The editor felt sure that prohibition would be a permanent part of our national life because it had been the result of ten years of deliberation on the part of the citizens of the country. He also had high hopes for the good effects of prohibition from an economic point of view.[35]

The reasons given for the support of prohibition were essentially the same as those we have just discussed in connection with the actions of the Synods. The Lutheran stressed the fact that this was a moral and not simply a political issue. The editor's enthusiasm caused him to call national prohibition the greatest law since the Emancipation.[36] Because this was a moral question, the editor felt that the State had a right to look to the Church to provide aid in producing the moral climate that would make the prohibition law effective. "Our own personal belief," he wrote, "is that a moral element underlies the drink question. The Church and its members must appraise that moral element in its relation to our day, when we have highly organized social conditions...."[37]

In the mind of the editor of The Lutheran, the moral issue seemed to be closely connected with the idea of a concern for weaker brethren. While there are references to this in the actions of the Synods, they are scant. In The Lutheran, however, it is almost a controlling idea. Immediately after prohibition had become a national law, the editor stressed the fact that for Christians it was the inner law of concern

for others rather than the law of the State which was most compelling.[38] Again, discussing the matter of individual liberty, he stated that "the obligation of the majority to surrender patronage of a beverage so harmful to a portion of society, conforms so exactly to an ethical law as to demand acceptance of it.... We believe the Church's members owe the victims of intemperance individual abstention from the use of alcoholic beverages and continued support of the effort to remove completely the source of drunkenness and its resultant evils."[39] Yet again, The Lutheran declared itself for continuance of the Volstead Act, reenforcing its argument that the strong ought to be considerate of the weak. Stating the opinion that even though some Christians may be able to use alcoholic beverages in moderation, the fact that some people cannot means that "personal liberty (is) best used in their behalf rather than in self-indulgence to even a moderate degree...."[40]

The argument that prohibition should be supported simply because it is the law of the country also carried some weight with The Lutheran. The lawlessness that was so much a characteristic of this period was frequently deplored. A citizen, and particularly a Christian citizen, owed the duty of obedience to the State. "Law is law," wrote the editor, "whether approved by an influential minority or not, and any man who winks at the breaking of law because it is not popular with a large minority is encouraging the spirit of lawlessness which at present is threatening the very foundations on which our system of government rests."[41]

In spite of the support for this position, The Lutheran quite evidently felt that Christians should have a more fundamental attitude

toward the moral issues involved. The actions of the United Lutheran Church, for example, were criticized on this basis. "The United Lutheran Church," wrote the editor, "through the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare has... urged the members of its congregations to observe the law as enacted, but we can find no explicit exhortation for total abstinence; only for patriotism. However, a considerable group, probably a larger majority of our membership favor the continuance of the prohibition policy...."[42]

One of the theologians of the U.L.C.A. took issue with the editor of The Lutheran in his contention that the interests of morality were served only by total abstinence. He could not see that that was the teaching of Scripture at all. In fact, the moderate use of alcoholic beverages seemed to him to be condoned by the Bible.[43] The editor replied to this that if the use of alcoholic beverages were generally to be completely temperate, there would probably be no objection. The difficulty seemed to be that for a significant part of the population any temptation led to abuse. Consequently, it was the duty of all to be concerned about them. This, he said, looked like a moral issue to him.

Occasional references to the indifference on the part of church members to national prohibition reflect the fact that there was not total support within the U.L.C.A. for this law. This was deplored by The Lutheran. "What concerns us most deeply," an editorial stated, "is the attitude of many church members toward that law. It cannot be denied that in the hearts of many, who would feel slandered if they were called unchristian and unpatriotic, there is a secret wish that prohibition may prove a failure. They considered it a piece of fanatical and drastic

legislation from the beginning, incapable of being made effective for lack of sufficient public sentiment in its favor, and now seem willing to have their views of it confirmed, regardless of the cost."[45] Again, an editorial stated: "It is, to say the least, disconcerting to find Christians more disposed to criticize the Volstead Act than to condemn the bootleggers and lawbreakers."[46]

While fully supporting the prohibition law, the editor of The Lutheran realized that legislation alone could not accomplish all that was desired. Consequently, he occasionally reminded the Church that something more fundamental was necessary, namely, a conversion to Christ and continued education. "It rests with the Church," he said, "...to strive to the utmost to supplant the lusts of the flesh and put the love of Christ in their place."[47] Similarly education was recognized as an important method by which true temperance could be achieved.[48]

Although The Lutheran frequently called upon the government for stricter law enforcement and urged all citizens to cooperate in this, it made very few suggestions concerning specific legislation. It did call attention to elections that were being held in various states and in 1932, it also urged its readers to contact all Senators, since it had been announced that hearings were to be held on bills bearing on the liquor laws.[49] Beyond this, however, there is little activity in this direction.[50]

Thus, The Lutheran continued to support national prohibition throughout the years that that law was in existence. Shortly before it was repealed the editor wrote: "We... have no reason to change our attitude relative to the desirability of eliminating this source

of social evil. Nobody is dependent upon an alcoholic beverage for the quenching of thirst and for many people it is the source of suffering and degradation."[51] Throughout the years, the editor felt that in the use of alcoholic beverages a great moral issue was involved. This seemed to focus itself largely upon a concern for weaker brethren. The editor realized that in many of his discussions he was going far beyond pronouncements of the U.L.C.A. on the subject, but it seemed to him that his positions were a logical outcome of Christian concern.

In looking back over the entire period of the existence of the national prohibition law, therefore, we can observe that a diversity of opinion existed within the U.L.C.A. in regard thereto. The Lutheran and many of the Synods gave themselves to the temperance cause with enthusiasm. Basically they looked upon it as a great moral issue in which the Church was involved. The U.L.C.A., as it expressed itself through its conventions, refused to define it as a moral issue. It simply urged observance of law. Perhaps the most typical and representative statement of the thinking of the official Church on this entire matter is one that was given by the President of the Church in 1936. He wrote:

> Prohibition is now the law of the land. That law is notoriously broken even by some Church members. In view of those facts all churches must emphasize today obedience to the law. Any public statements which by their emphasis encourage disobedience are unchristian, immoral, and anarchistic. That first of all is where the Lutheran Church stands in the present controversy.
>
> It is unquestionably true that the drinking of liquor is in itself no sin. It is furthermore true that Christianity does not believe men can be made genuinely good by legal restrictions. On this account the Lutheran Church does not believe the Kingdom of God is ever advanced by the enactment of laws.

> The question of prohibition as a law of the land is not therefore a religious question. It is a question as to what is desirable for our national and social and economic life. Christians may and should freely discuss it from that point of view. As a citizen I believe it to be a desirable law. Speaking for the Lutheran Church, however, I return to my first emphasis and know that such emphasis truly represents the Church.[52]

Let us turn now from a consideration of the attitude of the Church during the life of the Eighteenth Amendment to a delineation of its attitude from the time of the repeal of that amendment to the present. The repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment was met with widespread concern on the part of many of the Synods and The Lutheran as well, as a step that was injurious to the health of the nation. Largely, in the ensuing years, these sources contented themselves by pointing out the evils of repeal and by occasionally suggesting solutions for the new situation. Such resolutions and articles continued throughout the 1930's, but in the 1940's there was an evident lessening of interest in the entire subject even though temperance and the use of alcoholic beverages were still matters of some concern. This lessening of interest has, of course, been true of the entire Christian Church. It can be attributed at least in part to the serious defeat that the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment meant to those who were interested in promoting abstinence and to the inability of these forces to develop any other strategy which could capture the interest of the nation. Moreover, in the Church generally, new moral enthusiasms surged to the forefront, namely, primary attention has been given to such things as war and peace, management and labor, race relations and the like. In the U.L.C.A., this was intensified by the fact that the Eighteenth Amendment had quite obviously never had unanimous support within the Church in the first place.

As has already been indicated many of the Synods met Repeal and the situation which developed after Repeal, by pointing out the evils which the legalization of liquor had let loose upon the country. "...We deplore the action of our body politic in this matter..." stated the Temperance Committee of the West Virginia Synod.[53] The Susquehanna Synod's Committee gave "the following evaluation of Anti-Prohibition which swept down from politicians loaded with legions of promises assuring the elimination of Bootlegging, Youth Drinking and of Adult Insobriety:"

> They promised us immediate financial relief and a lowering of the taxes with the foam that overflows the glass and the liberality of crazed men, and we are still waiting for the balancing of the National Budget. The latest that we have heard is increased appropriation for the reduction of a rapidly increasing Bootleg Enterprise.54

Several years later this same Committee deplored the fact that

> ...our youth are now tempted by moral conditions in our road houses and beer gardens, immeasureably worse than in the days of the old saloon. It is not enough for us as Christian leaders to deplore the increased drunkenness, the multiplication of wholesale and retail liquor establishments, the fearful number of more than 10,000 killed either by drunken drivers or caused by drunken drivers or caused by drunken pedestrians, the sorrow and misery caused in thousands of homes, and the debauching of our national honor by stooping to gain revenue from an admitted vice. In its ruthless greed for money and political power the liquor business respects no law and it holds nothing sacred. It is a destroyer always; it kills bodies and damns souls; there is not a good word that can be said for it.55

Several other Synods also deplored the evils connected with Repeal and turned their thought to the possibility of solving the new problem. At least one of them announced its intention of working for a new prohibition law.[56] Others called for legislation that would place strict

controls upon the liquor industry, such as the limitation of advertising, and a regulation of places where alcoholic beverages were sold.[57] In spite of these appeals for legislative action, the general tendency after the Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment was to go back to the method of education for temperance. "Our task... as a Church is to continue a program of education,..."[58] stated the Temperance Committee of the West Virginia Synod. "We urge our people," stated a similar committee to the West Pennsylvania Synod, "...to adopt a plan of education so that every individual... shall be taught the effects of strong drink and how difficult it is to control its traffic and sale."[59] The Michigan Synod recommended "that pastors and laymen study carefully the moral ills accompanying our present liquor traffic, and urge true Christian temperance."[60]

During World War II, the voices of a few Synods were raised to the effect that the liquor traffic was injurious to the welfare of the nation, and requesting the government to take appropriate action in order to control this industry.[61] On the whole, however, by the 1940's, most consideration of the subject of the use of alcoholic beverages or prohibition had disappeared from the consideration of the Synods. There were no more calls for national prohibition, possibly due in part to a feeling that such an attempt would be hopeless. As we have just indicated, there were still a few voices calling for governmental control of the use of alcohol, but basically where consideration is given at all, it is given in terms of the method described by the Department of Social Action of the South Carolina Synod, which stated that "our approach is non-political, but educational, evangelical and positive."[62]

After the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment The Lutheran published very few articles pertaining to alcoholic beverages. Those that were published deplored the evil effects that Repeal had had upon the life of the nation.[63] After listing a number of these injurious effects, an editorial stated: "The fact is that an evil is inherent in the use of alcoholic beverages, and there is no way in which the effects of alcohol can be so completely safeguarded as to avoid some over-indulgence in it to the point of intoxication. There is also a sinister quality in the trade which invariably produces graft, evasion of law and bribery of officials...."[64]

Few of the articles or editorials in The Lutheran suggested any solutions, except for a recognition of the fact that since the whole subject was now in the realm of personal morals, each Christian had a duty to educate himself to the facts of the situation and judge his conduct accordingly. There has been some discussion in recent years, particularly in the column conducted by Dr. Blackwelder, of the possibility of controlling the liquor trade and especially the advertising of alcoholic beverages.[65] It is true that in 1947 the Rev. Harold Reisch published an article which called upon the Church to face squarely the major social problem caused by alcohol. He wrote:

> Regardless of whether one regards the record of the past as a futile, half-hearted gesture, or a wise marking of time pending the arrival of new light on the subject, this much must be said: the time has come for a complete reappraisal and restatement of the church's attitude. Alcohol is a major social problem. This has been proven without a shadow of doubt. A tremendous mass of knowledge, drawn from sound scientific research, is available for the use of the Christian educator and writer.
>
> The church admits responsibility in this field. The day has come for her to exercise it to the full.[66]

Beyond these occasional references, however, the subject has all but disappeared from the pages of the official church magazine.

In summarizing the content of this chapter, it is important that we once again point out the discrepancy that apparently existed between the attitude of the official Church on the matter of alcoholic beverages and the attitude of large segments of the Church. If, on the one hand, one looks solely at the official Minutes of the U.L.C.A., one is driven to the conclusion that the U.L.C.A. showed a fundamental indifference to the entire matter. There are only about half a dozen resolutions on the subject at all. None of these resolutions give support to abstinence from alcoholic beverages as a Christian virtue. Likewise, none of them urged support of national prohibition on its own merits, but rather completely in terms of the obedience that citizens owe to the State in observing its laws. Moreover, the U.L.C.A. has produced only two pamphlets on the subject over the years.[67]

If, on the other hand, one turns to the official church magazine and to the actions of many of the Synods, one can easily become convinced from a mass of evidence that the U.L.C.A. showed crusading zeal both for abstinence and national prohibition.

Actually, there was strong sentiment within the U.L.C.A. both for abstinence and prohibition. While this was highly influential, it was not enough to move the entire Church to this position. While the general church body condemned the abuse of alcoholic beverages and believed that the evils of the liquor traffic should be controlled, it refused to define the use of such beverages in moral terms.

It is interesting to observe that the U.L.C.A., through its Synods,

articles and editorials, gave more support to legislation in regard to this particular problem than it did to any other. Although the editor of The Lutheran did occasionally have some scruples about the accomplishment of reform through legislation, these seemed to be overcome by the obvious rightness and necessity of such legislation to all right thinking people. Although this subject was given no consideration in the theological journals of the Church, it found strong support in the official church magazine. Although the general principles of observance of law and consideration for weaker brethren were stressed many times by The Lutheran, this magazine went further to look upon the whole matter of abstinence in the use of alcoholic beverages and the support of national prohibition as a moral issue.

Since the Repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, there has been no call on the part of the U.L.C.A., either officially or unofficially, with the exception of actions by one or two Synods, for a return to national prohibition. The years immediately following Repeal, were occupied with a criticism of the broken promises and the evils of the liquor trade. During the 1940's, interest in the subject has in good measure abated although there are occasional outbursts of interest in one aspect or another. Whatever articles have been published within recent years have expressed an awareness of the evils that alcoholic beverages can present to any society and of a thorough dissatisfaction with the present situation in our own society. Beyond suggestions for the limiting of advertising and the necessity for constant education, however, there have been few attempts at suggested solutions.

There seems to be an awareness that the abuse of alcoholic beverages is creating grave moral and social problems in society. No one

seems to be particularly clear, however, as to what should be done about it.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter XVI Alcoholic Beverages and Prohibition

1. "Proceedings of the 48th Convention of the General Synod," in *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1918, p. 111.

2. *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1918, p. 96.

3. *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1934, pp. 355, 356 and 523 (Report of Inner Mission Board).

4. *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1936, p. 284.

5. *The Lutheran*, April 2, 1936, XVIII, 27, p. 7.

6. *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1938, p. 373.

7. *Minutes*, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., May 13, 1943, Vol. II, p. 13.

8. *Minutes*, U.L.C.A., 1948, p. 374.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 374, 384, 385 and 688.

10. *Minutes*, Kansas Synod, 1918, p. 15 (Report of Temperance Committee).

11. *Minutes*, West Virginia Synod, 1919, p. 41.

12. See, for example, the *Minutes* of the following Synods:
    Central Pennsylvania, 1920, p. 51; 1921, p. 55.
    East Pennsylvania, 1920, p. 89; 1921, pp. 61 and 62; 1922, p. 68; 1923, pp. 88 and 89; 1924, p. 85; 1925, p. 90, 1927, p. 102; 1928, p. 103; 1932, p. 101; 1933, p. 142.
    Susquehanna, 1927, p. 79; 1931, p. 87; 1932, pp. 93 and 94; 1933, p. 76.
    Pittsburgh, 1928, pp. 178 and 179; 1930, p. 192.
    West Pennsylvania, 1930, p. 100.
    Alleghany, 1932, p. 34; 1933, p. 51.
    Ohio, 1921, p. 144; 1923, pp. 118 and 119; 1924, p. 98; 1925, p. 109; 1926, p. 101; 1927, p. 89; 1933, p. 88.
    New York, 1923, p. 62; 1924, p. 71.
    New York and New England, 1927, p. 65.
    Maryland, 1923, p. 77; 1928, p. 107.
    West Virginia, 1927, p. 55; 1932, p. 62; 1933, p. 51.
    Illinois, 1931, p. 91.

13. Minutes, East Pennsylvania Synod, 1923, p. 88.

14. Minutes, Susquehanna Synod, 1927, p. 79. See also, 1931, p. 87.

15. Minutes, East Pennsylvania Synod, 1932, p. 101.

16. Minutes, Ohio Synod, 1924, p. 98.

17. Minutes, West Virginia Synod, 1927, p. 55.

18. For further discussion of this point, see many of the references which have been given in note 13 above.

19. Minutes, New York Synod, 1924, p. 71.

20. Minutes, Ohio Synod, 1933, p. 88. This Synod also stated in 1921 through its Resolutions Committee (Minutes, p. 144): "We... urge... continued teaching of personal abstinence from the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage for the benefit of the individual,... upon the Pauline principle of helping our weaker brethren in society."

21. Minutes, Central Pennsylvania Synod, 1921, p. 55. (Report of Temperance Committee).

22. It must be pointed out, however, that more reliance was placed upon the efficacy of legislation in this regard than there was with reference to any other social or moral problem. The East Pennsylvania Synod, for example, resolved in 1923 that "the members of our congregations be urged to cooperate with the legal authorities in suppressing violations by reporting to them those who are engaging in the prohibited traffic." (Minutes, p. 68).

23. Minutes, Ohio Synod, 1926, p. 101 (Committee on Social Reform).

24. Minutes, West Pennsylvania Synod, 1930, p. 100 (Temperance Committee).

25. Minutes, West Virginia Synod, 1932, p. 62.

26. Minutes, Central Pennsylvania Synod, 1920, p. 52.

27. Minutes, East Pennsylvania Synod, 1920, p. 89.

28. Minutes, East Pennsylvania Synod, 1921, p. 62. This Synod also communicated officially with the Federal Prohibition Commissioner for Pennsylvania "commending his earnest efforts at enforcement and pledging him... support." (Minutes, 1922, p. 69). See also unfavorable reference to specific legislation on the part of the State government (Minutes, 1925, p. 90).

29. Minutes, Maryland Synod, 1923, p. 77. The Ohio Synod also commended the National government for its attempts to strengthen enforcement of the prohibition laws (Minutes, 1925, p. 109). See also, Minutes, West Virginia Synod, 1927, p. 55.

30. Minutes, Pittsburgh Synod, 1928, p. 179.

31. Minutes, Illinois Synod, 1931, p. 91.

32. Minutes, Susquehanna Synod, 1933, p. 76.

33. Minutes, Alleghany Synod, 1933, p. 51.

34. "The Drink Question," The Lutheran, January 23, 1919, XXIII, 17, p. 1.

35. "National Prohibition," The Lutheran, January 23, 1919, XXIII, 17, p. 2.

36. "A Paragraph Political", The Lutheran, September 23, 1920, II, 21, p. 346.

37. "The Liquor Evil," The Lutheran, March 4, 1926, VIII, 33, p. 4.

38. The Lutheran, July 10, 1919, I, 11, p. 210.

39. "The Will of the People, " The Lutheran, January 23, 1930, XII, 17, p. 4.

40. "The Christian Citizen", The Lutheran, October 16, 1930, XIII, 3, p. 15.

41. "Quit Criticizing the Law: Obey It," The Lutheran, July 19, 1923, V, 42, p. 10. See also, August 30, 1923, V, 48, p. 3.

42. "Personal Liberty," The Lutheran, August 30, 1928, X, 48, p. 14.

43. John C. Mattes, "Open Letters," The Lutheran, September 20, 1928, X, 51, p. 21.

44. Loc. cit.

45. "Shall Prohibition Prohibit?", The Lutheran, February 3, 1921, III, 19, p. 17.

46. The Lutheran, July 19, 1923, V, 42, p. 10.

47. "Drink and Drugs," The Lutheran, June 5, 1919, I, 6, p. 119.

See also, editorial, "Expecting Too Much of Prohibition," May 22, 1919, I, 4, p. 71.

48. The Lutheran, October 1, 1925, VIII, 1, p. 4.

49. Editorial, "The Christian Citizen," The Lutheran, October 16, 1930, XIII, 3, p. 4.

50. Editorial, "Liquor Legislation," The Lutheran, January 7, 1932, XIV, 15, pp. 14 and 15.

51. The Lutheran, March 31, 1932, XIV, 27, p. 15.

52. F.H. Knubel, The Lutheran, March 4, 1926, VIII, 23, p. 3.

53. Minutes, West Virginia Synod, 1933, p. 51.

54. Minutes, Susquehanna Synod, 1934, p. 89.

55. Minutes, Susquehanna Synod, 1938, pp. 77 and 78.

56. Minutes, West Pennsylvania Synod, 1935, p. 95. See also, Minutes, Susquehanna Synod, 1937, p. 83.

57. See, for example, the Minutes of the following Synods:
West Pennsylvania, 1936, p. 89; 1937, p. 114.
Pittsburgh, 1936, p. 121.
Susquehanna, 1936, p. 94.
Kentucky-Tennessee, 1936, p. 27.
Central Pennsylvania, 1945, pp. 206 and 207.

58. Minutes, West Virginia Synod, 1934, p. 23.

59. Minutes, West Pennsylvania Synod, 1935, p. 95.

60. Minutes, Michigan Synod, 1935, p. 45. See also the Minutes of the following Synods:
West Pennsylvania, 1936, pp. 88 and 89; 1937, p. 114.
Kentucky-Tennessee, 1936, p. 27.
Rocky Mountain, 1936, p. 17.
Susquehanna, 1937, p. 83; 1938, pp. 77 and 78.
South Carolina, 1945, p. 95.
California, 1946, p. 49.
Some of the Synods were still strongly counseling abstinence as being the only method that was in harmony with Christian ethics and asking the Church to teach this method through all its agencies. See Minutes, Pittsburgh Synod, 1936, pp. 120 and 121.

61. See Minutes: West Virginia Synod, 1943, p. 45, 1944, p. 48; Central Pennsylvania Synod, 1945, pp. 206 and 207.

62. Minutes, South Carolina Synod, 1945, p. 95.

63. See The Lutheran, December 13, 1934, XVII, 11, p. 13; March 22, 1939, XXI, 25, p. 15; April 3, 1946, XXVIII, 27, p. 34.

64. "A Year of Repeal," The Lutheran, December 13, 1934, XVII, 11, p. 13.

65. See The Lutheran, December 16, 1942, XXV, 11, p. 7; October 10, 1945, XXVIII, 2, p. 14, October 24, 1945, XXVIII, 4, p. 13; February 12, 1947, XXIX, 20, p. 11.

66. Harold Reisch, "Lutherans and Liquor," The Lutheran, June 11, 1947, XXIX, 37, p. 25.

67. W.H. Greever, "The Bible Speaks on the Liquor Problem."
Alfred L. Beck, "Why I Believe in Temperance."

CHAPTER XVII

THE ECONOMIC ORDER

The period 1918-1948 was noted for its economic changes and readjustments. It saw the height of prosperity and the depth of depression; it witnessed the rise of new agencies which sought to cope with the problem of economic unrest; it saw the economic system of the country being brought into question and modified. Immediately after World War I, there was a period of rather widespread industrial unrest in this country. Although many of the basic tensions of that period were left unresolved, they were temporarily put aside due to a wave of prosperity. This led to a great deal of speculation. When the bubble of speculation burst in 1929, the country suffered under almost a decade of depression. This, in turn, was followed by World War II and the adjustment of the economy of the nation to armaments. Following World War II, the backlog of demand for consumer goods and the international situation have functioned to keep our economy running at a high level.

This period also saw the rise to dominant strength of the labor union movement. Although labor unions had been in existence for many years prior to the first World War, it was after that war that they began to test their strength. This resulted in a great deal of industrial conflict. It was in good measure favorable legislation passed by the national government during the economic depression of the 1930's that assisted labor unions to their position of strength on the national

scene.

The years of our study also observed economic theories and systems brought into question. Particularly during the depression that affected most of the world, capitalism came under severe criticism. At the time of the first World War, the world saw the beginning of communism in Russia, then a feeble experiment. By the end of this period, communism was a dominant force in the world. In addition, many countries of the world experimented with fascism; notable among these were Germany and Italy. Meanwhile, in England, the forces of socialism were gathering strength, and toward the end of this period that country adopted many features of a socialistic program. All of these developments naturally had their effect upon the United States of America.

When the Depression came upon the United States at the end of 1929, our country sought to handle it in the usual way, eschewing governmental interference and with the expectation that the natural forces of supply and demand would soon strike a new balance in the economy. The resultant unemployment was dealt with as a state and municipal matter and by local relief agencies. As the Depression dragged on, however, and its severity increased, it became apparent that more heroic measures were necessary. As a result, we had the modification of our basic economic system that is represented in the "New Deal" and the development of governmental "Alphabet Agencies." Without going into the changed philosophy and method that this represented, we can simply point out that its great significance was that the government played a part in the economic enterprise which it had never done before. Whereas in 1918 laissez-faire capitalism was the dominant economic system of the country,

in 1948, although the system was still basically capitalistic, it was a greatly modified form of capitalism.

The initial reaction of many of the denominations in America to the process and problems of industrialization had been the development of the Social Gospel. Although this movement was interested in the betterment of all aspects of the social order, it was in the economic order that its activities found their focus. This was logical enough since it was in the economic order that most of the profound changes, influencing all of society, were taking place.

During the half century between the Civil War and World War I, the industrialization of the United States proceeded at a rapid pace. Moreover, laissez-faire capitalism was established as the dominant economic system by means of which the economic processes were ordered. During this period, the Social Gospel movement was highly critical of economic and industrial abuses, and frequently, of the economic system itself.[1] Frequent suggestions were heard proposing the substitution of Socialism for Capitalism as an economic system that would be more in harmony with Christian standards.

As has been discussed previously, the Lutheran Church in America quite generally rejected the Social Gospel on theological grounds. Even where it entered into this movement in some measure, as in the case of the General Synod, it dealt very gingerly with economic problems.[2] The U.L.C.A. inherited from its predecessor bodies no tradition of giving consideration to the problems arising out of the economic order.

Let us turn now to some of the reactions of the U.L.C.A. to the many economic developments of the period 1918-1948. Once again we

discover that there is not much to be found in the reports and actions of the legislative bodies of the Church. Although economic matters were discussed with fair frequency in the periodical literature of the Church, not much of this discussion reached the conventions of the Church. We shall, therefore, set forth all actions taken by the U.L.C.A. in this regard without giving consideration to outline or chronological order since these actions are so few. Then we shall observe something of the concern of the Board of Social Missions with the problems of labor as revealed in the official minutes of this body. The actions or reports of the Synods will be presented in chronological sequence in order to give the reaction to various economic developments. Finally, the periodical literature will be analyzed according to the following outline:

(1) The reactions of the Church to developments on the economic scene, namely, prosperity and speculation, unemployment and depression, the "New Deal," the labor union movement and industrial unrest, and various suggestions for improvement;

(2) Criticisms of the economic system;

(3) The reactions of the Church to proposed substitutes for capitalism, namely, fascism, communism and socialism;

(4) The duty of the Church concerning the economic order.

The U.L.C.A. in convention assembled did not discuss matter pertaining to the economic order at all until the onset of the Depression in the 1930's. Even then, most of the references to this subject in the Minutes of the U.L.C.A. are concerned with the problem of unemployment. This was dealt with, however, not in terms of criticism of the

economic order under which such widespread unemployment could be possible, but rather in terms of urging the government to take measures to provide relief and urging the congregations to undertake Christian charity and relief. In the developing struggle between capital and labor, the Church deliberately tried to avoid taking sides, feeling that its ministry was to all men regardless of the groups or classes to which they happened to belong.

"Our Church must take its place in the ranks of the agencies seeking to relieve distress," reported the Inner Mission Board to the 1930 convention of the Church.[3] It seemed to this Board that the work of the Church was fulfilled in a combination of the preaching of the Gospel and the performance of works of mercy.[4] This report also implied that the root cause of the Depression was sin. It had come about because of human pride, greed and exploitation. The most important function of the Church was to meet this issue of sin. Consequently, it was the task of the Church clearly and fearlessly to "proclaim those fundamental truths of the gospel which if honestly applied to the causes underlying the strained economic conditions of today, would prevent their recurrence and a possible disaster."[5]

At the following convention of the Church, the Inner Mission Board reported that in order to make the resolution concerning congregational aid to the unemployed more effective, it had published a plan by means of which all congregations could assist their members who needed relief.[6] At the same convention, the Commissioners to the National Lutheran Council reported that that agency had been participating in the President's Organization for Unemployment Relief. Ways in which the Church

could help in the present emergency were enumerated as urging the return of boys and girls to school rather than seeking employment, urging each congregation to take care of the needy within its own membership, and participating in the relief efforts of the community.[7]

In the same year, the Church adopted a resolution recommended by the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare. This resolution is important because it expressed the judgment of the Church that the conditions of the day were not the fault of any particular economic system, and that the ultimate remedy was to be found in a spiritual regeneration of individuals:

> Resolved, That the United Lutheran Church hereby expresses its deepest concern on account of the distress arising from present economic conditions, especially on account of the sufferings of millions of unemployed people and those dependent upon them; and that it implores its members everywhere to use this opportunity to demonstrate the spirit of Christ through kind, sympathetic assistance wherever it can be given; and, since such conditions as now prevail may characterize any particular economic system, it declares it to be its conviction that the practice of true Christian Brotherhood and Stewardship is the only universally effective security for economic and social justice, and points to the promotion of the same as a basic duty of the Church in seeking to remedy causes, while it gives special aid for the immediate relief of a person's suffering.[8]

At no time did the conventions of the U.L.C.A. deal with the problem of competing economic systems, except for references to communism and totalitarianism as menaces to the life of the Church. At the 1934 convention, the Church adopted a resolution of support for the German Church which was facing the pressures of a totalitarian government, and a resolution to Adolph Hitler protesting coercion of the Church and expressing the hope that the "Lutheran churches of Germany may have

entire freedom to proclaim the Gospel..."[9] In the last report given by Dr. Knubel as President of the Church (1942), he stressed the dangers of communism and totalitarianism, identifying them with idolatry and heresy.[10]

In 1944, the Committee on Reference and Counsel recommended the following resolution which was adopted by the convention:

> We recommend the adoption of a resolution presented... by the Rev. R.R. Belter, President of the Wartburg Synod, namely, that the Board of Social Missions together with the Executive Board be requested to formulate a statement on labor and the Church.[11]

This resolution was referred to the Board of Social Missions, which body formulated a statement on the Church and labor. This statement was then adopted both by the Board of Social Missions and the Executive Board in the name of the Church and published as the official stand of the U.L.C.A. on the Church and labor.

Before we present this crystallized thinking of the Church on this problem, let us turn to the Minutes of the Inner Mission Board and the Board of Social Missions in order to become aware of some of the background activities of the Church in this matter. The fact that a need for some statement on labor was felt very early is indicated by the 1919 Minutes of the Inner Mission Board in which the following resolution was adopted:

> RESOLVED that we refer to a special committee for further consideration the preparation of a statement on the labor problem, this to be submitted to the Board members and, after suggestion by them, to be approved by the Executive Board of the Church for their approval. (sic) 12

In spite of the fact that a committee was appointed for this, there is no record that such a statement was ever adopted.

After this there is little consideration given to problems arising from the economic order, with the exception of the problem of unemployment during the Depression to which we have already given consideration.

One of the functions of the Board of Social Missions was to provide social action institutes throughout the Church for the education of the membership of the Church in the relation of the Christian faith to social problems. One of the subjects that was dealt with frequently was that of industrial relations. The Executive Secretary reported to the 1940 Board of Social Missions meeting "that arrangements were made for a series of Conferences on 'The Church and Industrial Relations'...."[13] Again, at the meeting of the Board in the following year, concern was expressed over the relation of the Church to industrial workers:

> One of the pressing problems to which the attention of the Department (of Social Action) has been called is that of the relation of the Church to the laboring classes. It is a matter for deep concern that large numbers of industrial workers hold themselves aloof from the Church, alleging that Christian leaders have catered to the middle and upper classes, espoused the cause of capitalism against the masses, complacently disregarded the needs and interests of the common man while appealing to him for support, failed to interest themselves in securing an adequate understanding and appreciation of labor problems, and in general have contributed to the estrangement of large numbers of laboring people from the Church. While the Church has in a measure demonstrated its interest in the common man by ministering from week to week to thousands of faithful members gathered from the ranks of laboring classes, it nevertheless needs to recognize with proper apprehension, penitence, and appreciation its responsibility toward removing the barriers by which men have become estranged from the Church.14

As a result of this general statement, a resolution was adopted which recommended:

> That we appeal to our pastors and Christian leaders to study

> sympathetically labor problems in their communities, to mingle with laboring men in their industrial situations and in meetings of their organizations, to initiate interests which in a positive way may counterbalance the radical elements in labor unions, and to seek in every proper way to restore Christianity to its rightful place in the minds of the masses.15

Further evidence of the Church's concern for its knowledge about the realm of industrial relations is given by the appearance of Dr. Greever, Secretary of the U.L.C.A., before the Directors of the Board of Social Missions to urge that a Dr. Henry Metcalf be engaged on a consultative basis to give the Board of Social Missions factual knowledge of the situation existing between employer and employee. This was to involve written and personal reports. The motive behind this move, as Dr. Greever stated it, was that the Church might avoid the embarrassment of speaking in general terms without knowing the specific details of a situation. As a result of this, the Directors appointed a special committee to investigate the standing of Dr. Metcalf and to begin on this project in cooperation with the National Lutheran Council if the committee felt it advisable.[16] There is no record, however, that anything further came of this proposal.

The Board of Social Missions has continued to urge pastors to be active in the solution of industrial problems. At its 1947 meeting it adopted a resolution suggesting "that pastors and lay leaders, wherever feasible, should initiate conferences between opposing forces in industrial disputes and strikes for objective discussion of problems on the basis of sound Christian principles," and another encouraging "pastors to share their experiences in solving local industrial problems by reporting the same to our Board."[17]

Even though the references are not abundant, it is obvious that the Church is becoming increasingly concerned with problems arising from the economic order. The following paragraph from the Minutes of the Board of Social Missions, for example, reveals such a changed attitude. It is hardly possible that in the early years of the U.L.C.A. the things mentioned in this paragraph would have been considered the business of the Church, much less its duty:

> That the Church has a responsibility toward restoring to normalcy a society torn by inflation, strikes, wage maladjustments and business bottlenecks is indisputable. Back of the tensions tearing society asunder lie greed, lust for power, political aspirations, and inflationary insecurity. The weakening of governmental agencies through complexities created by war and the strengthening of labor organizations through strikes and economic contingencies have resulted in disruptive hazards in American life. It is incumbent upon the Church to protect against abusive power wherever centered and against the assumption by any groups of rights which if exercised entail suffering and hardship for the general public. On the other hand, the Church should proclaim the necessity of full employment for the attainment of normal economic life, the protection of every group in society, the farmer, the factory worker, the miner, businessman and professional, and the promotion of proper production to alleviate all business bottlenecks, stimulate trade, reduce inflation, and restore a sense of economic security. The Church should arouse its people to an appreciation of present economic potentials, on the one hand, to stir up dissension and even civil strife; on the other, to insure a period of vast social and material progress. 18

We have set the reports and resolutions of the Board of Social Missions in this place in order that it might be realized that the official statement of the Church on labor did not spring forth suddenly and unexpectedly, but was rooted in the soil of constant previous discussion. This statement was issued under the title, "The Church Speaks on Labor".[19] Its intent is to advance principles not programs for

specific actions. This is done deliberately, for it is believed that the former lies within the province of the Church, while the latter does not. Without proper principles as a guide, no solution is ever possible. This document begins with the statement that: "The Church, as it proclaims Christian principles, provides the only complete and perfect solution for human problems. Serious tensions are arising today in the field of labor relationships. Here also Christian principles provide the solution...." This statement is divided into three parts; the first enumerates basic principles; the second sets forth duties and rights; the third states what the Church must do.

1. Basic Principles

The basic principles can be summarized in the following statements. God's moral order recognizes no class system. In His sight every calling which contributes to human welfare is sacred and has His blessing. God ordained work for all, and possessions are to be looked upon as a sacred trust. God expects all labor to be amply rewarded. Moreover, we are to remember that our earning capacity comes from Him as well as forgiveness of sins in Christ without which no abundant life is possible. God expects us to share the burdens of daily life. It is then stated as a basic principle of the Church that social problems can find their ultimate solution only in the spiritual sphere:

> The ultimate solution of all human conflict is not in the realm of law but in the spiritual sphere of love. There is no law perfect enough, nor human judgment wise enough in itself to solve the conflicts which arise in the selfish struggle for possessions. Not legalism but the grace of God, not contract ultimately, but Christ's spirit of brotherhood and service in the hearts of men are the true source of blessed relationships in all human affairs. 20

2. Duties and Rights

This part points out that it is the duty of all men to work, that each man should be able to choose his work and receive an adequate wage commensurate with his abilities, and that the social order should be so organized to provide for every man these opportunities as well as the additional benefits of a provision for the protection of possessions and for the fullest education of all people. Moreover, it is the duty and right of every man to provide the most favorable conditions for a happy home and family life, to be able to worship God according to his own conscience, and to cooperate in the maintenance of government so that equal protection for all might be established without discrimination as to race, color or creed.

The right of workers to organize for collective bargaining was recognized as well as the right to set up "such forms of health and accident insurance, provision for medical care, unemployment relief and insurance, and old age pensions as will provide security against the hazards of life."[21] Both management and labor, however, were under an obligation "to accept and support conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes."[22]

3. The Duty of the Church

Under the heading of "What the Church Must Do," part three states that the Church must proclaim its doctrines of stewardship, Christian sacrifice and love, and confront all men with the message of Jesus Christ. It must look to its own practical example in society, especially in such things as investments, use of labor, and remuneration for services. It must champion the just cause of every man, uphold the

dignity of labor, and advocate that service to society be regarded as the standard of social work. It must insist that democracy in industry is the only foundation for economic well-being and seek to develop good will between various groups. It should protest the use of force, violence and sabotage by either labor or management in industrial disputes, but be ready to offer its own facilites for conferences of management and labor.

In analyzing this document, we are impressed by the fact that it is religiously rather than economically oriented. This, of course, ought properly to be expected from a Church. The difficulty is that in so far as application to specific economic situations is concerned, the statements are so general that all sides to any industrial conflict could give adherence to most of them. If the Church, for example, had declared fifty years ago, or even thirty, that it is the right of every man to organize with his fellow workers for collective bargaining, this would have been an important statement. Under present conditions, however, even the National Association of Manufacturers concedes this right. The basic questions of today concern the question of how this right should be exercised. What of the question of "closed" and "open" shops, or of the use of gigantic combinations of power on the part of both management and labor? The main problem today is not so much that of providing the right to provide welfare insurance, but rather the question of how it shall be accomplished. This cannot simply be relegated to the realm of politics since it has important moral implications. Moreover, even so controversial a statement as the one that says, "It is the right of every man..., wherever feasible, in cooperation with

his co-workers, to share in the direction and management of his labors,"[23] is left without further elaboration. Depending upon what is meant by it, it could mean no change from the present situation in which labor unions exert some such influence, or it could mean a vast modification of our capitalistic system.

In spite of these criticisms, it must be recognized that this statement represents an important change in the thinking of the U.L.C.A., in that the Church is willing officially to state, even in principles, its attitude on some of the problems arising from the economic order. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the U.L.C.A. still bases its thinking on the idea that it is the duty of other institutions and agencies in society, not the Church, to implement the general principles drawn by the Church from the Word of God.

With this activity of the U.L.C.A. as a background, let us turn now to the actions of the Synods in order to discover what consideration these constituent bodies gave to economic problems. As we examine the Minutes of the Synods, we find that references to the industrial situation or the economic order were not extensive. Most of them were prompted by a feeling of concern for what was happening on the national scene, but offered little remedy. Seldom was there any real criticism of the prevailing economic system, namely, capitalism, although occasional cries for the substitution of a system of unselfish service for the selfish profit motive seemed to point in that direction. Actually, references to the subject were too few to give much of an idea of basic attitudes. The Committee on Moral and Social Welfare of the New York and New England Synod called the attention of that Synod in 1926 and

again in 1927 to a number of strikes which were in progress at the time. It condemned the action of public officials in repressing free speech and lawful assembly as was done in the case of one strike.[24] While the committee refrained from passing judgment on the issues involved in the various industrial conflicts, it stated that "it is quite evident that the Church still has an urgent mission to perform in applying the Gospel in the field of industry."[25]

The Committee on Social Reform of the Ohio Synod indicated its gratitude at the steady progress that was being made in the field of industrial relations. "We devoutly hope," it said, "that Christian leaders, both among employers and employees, will seek even more diligently for the Christian way of living."[26]

Occasionally committees sought to advance remedies for economic ills, but generally these were in vague terms that did not strike at the heart of the problem. The Committee on Moral and Social Welfare of the Maryland Synod, for example, pointed out the discrepancy between wealth and poverty that could be found within the nation. Calling attention to the experiments in communism and fascism which were being tried in Russia and Italy, this committee stated that the solution of the problems of property is to be found in "the application of the Golden Rule in business and industry. As men come to realize that they are 'neighbors' to assist and comfort each other they will find the solution of their practical problems in the love of which the Nazareth Carpenter spoke."[27]

The Depression of the 1930's called forth several utterances by the Synods concerning the economic order. The New York Synod's Inner Mission Committee urged a study of "economic problems in the light of Christian

ethics."[28] In the following year, a similar committee of the Illinois Synod urged a change in spirit, from competition to cooperation, in the economic system.[29] Three years earlier, this committee brought the economic system into question even though substitution of another system was not advocated. "The present depression," it stated, "brings into the foreground grave social questions which must have a solution.... Unemployment problems must be solved...."[30]

The New York Synod's Inner Mission Committee gave its reaction briefly to social welfare legislation in the following terms: "Big business has long enjoyed protective legislation. Now, the common man is to be remembered with social security, minimum hours of labor, better housing, unemployment insurance, old age pensions, etc."[31] It further suggested that various congregational groups come together to study these topics from the Christian standpoint.

The Pittsburgh Synod in 1937 took the most specific actions of any Synod concerning matters of current importance in the economic order. It pointed out that "since the economic order makes such great demands on the time, energy, and thought of men, the church is vitally concerned with the ethical relations of our industrial and commercial life. The process of making a living should promote rather than hinder spiritual development."[32] It felt that the Church should not try to present "a specific and detailed program for the economic order. Rather, it is the duty of the church to apply the teachings of Jesus to all business and industrial relationships."[33] The current economic system was criticized by this committee on a number of counts. "In many respects," it stated,

> our economic order fails to measure up to Christian standards and motives. Human welfare has been subordinated to greed for immediate profit. This leads to the exploitation of women and children, dangerous working conditions and occupational diseases. Absentee ownership which is concerned only with dividends, has tended to depersonalize industry and replace control by, and for, those who work by hand or brain. National resources have been wasted and production controlled in the interests of selfish gain rather than human needs. There has been an atmosphere of suspicion and of mutual distrust between employer and employee leading to strikes and violence. Many are engaged in money-making enterprises which do not serve society, such as gambling, the appeal to gross appetites, and exploitative advertising.34

As a result of this, the Pittsburgh Synod passed the following resolutions:

> 1. That, we urge the practice of the Christian principles of brotherhood, cooperation, and concern for the common welfare in all economic relationships.
> 2. That, we urge that those who work be given a sustaining wage and a just share in the products of agriculture and industry.
> 3. That, we urge the safeguarding of all workers, urban and rural, against harmful conditions of labor and occupational industry.
> 4. That we endorse the principle of social insurance against sickness, accidents, want in old age, and unemployment.
> 5. That, children of tender age should not be deprived of reasonable opportunities for normal development, and we condemn exploitation of children by either parents or employers.
> 6. That, we urge that the worker give an honest return for his wages and that both employer and employees be concerned for the common good.
> 7. That, we urge pastors and churches, and classes and groups to organize study groups on the significance of the Gospel in its application to modern economic problems.35

One decade later, as the country was faced with totally different economic circumstances, this same Synod received a fairly extensive statement as to reasons why the Church ought to be concerned with economic problems. It stated that it was proceeding on the basic assumption that all the varied circumstances of life had their influence on shaping the lives of men for good or for ill. Consequently, anything

that enters into the making of these circumstances ought not to be foreign to the interests of the Church. The Church ought to be interested in wholesome working conditions for its people and in adequate wages for all workmen. "Wages", stated the committee,

> have a vital part in the establishing of attitudes and emotional reactions of the worker and his family to society. Good wages make for the realization of hopes with its consequent upsurgence (sic) of good will in the heart; poor wages for the deferment of hope and its resultant bitterness and malevolence toward society. Because of this the Church ought not to be indifferent to this phase of our social life. The great Head of the Church lived and died that men might have the abundant life. Men cannot live the abundant life spiritually, when they find themselves unable to provide the things that make for the abundant life. Among these things are freedom from the fear of poverty, the necessity to work when health demands a rest, and freedom of the spirit from the bitterness that comes to the heart when one considers the years of strength given in toil for only bread and a roof over the head with nothing left for recreation, travel, education, or even a rainy day.36

This committee protested against certain extremities to which organized labor had gone. Political action on the part of labor unions was considered an especially grave danger. It was felt that this was a threat to democratic government in that it would prompt similar action on the part of other groups in the nation and so create group distinction, class warfare and factionalism.

Addressing itself to Pastors, the committee stated: "It is only our duty as citizens to understand the problems of democratic government, but far above that, is the moral obligation upon us as spiritual guides, to understand the forces at work in our world that will degrade the souls of men and prevent the conditions under which the beauty of human life can come to its fullest expression."[37] Since many of these conditions were to be found in the economic order, it was consequently the

duty of the Church to concern itself with problems arising from that source.

From this paucity of references it can be seen that the Synods did not give much consideration to economic problems. A few of them were concerned with industrial strife, but offered no remedies except personal religious regeneration. The distress of unemployment during the Depression called forth a number of criticisms of the spirit of the economic system. Nowhere, however, was there an outright proposal for the substitution of a new economic order. In fact, the Synods gave no consideration whatsoever to substitute systems such as socialism, fascism or communism.[38]

Having considered all the official actions of the Church in respect of problems arising out of the economic order, let us now turn to some of the discussions accompanying these actions as given in the periodical literature of the Church.

Practically no consideration was given to the issues arising from the prosperity and speculation of the 1920's. Neither the fact that the economy of the nation was functioning at a high level, nor the fact that much of it was based upon the insecure foundation of speculation, occasioned much comment. Although fairly extensive consideration was given to the labor disputes of this decade (as we shall point out shortly), there did not seem to be much more in the economic order in the 1920's which merited attention on the part of the writers of the Church.

The serious readjustment of the economic system which occurred in the 1930's, and its resultant widespread unemployment, were different

matters. More attention was given, however, to the effect, that is, unemployment than to the cause, namely, the Depression. An article on unemployment in a 1922 issue of The Lutheran is a forerunner of a number that were to appear during the Depression of the 1930's. The solution offered is basically the same. Congregations were urged to appoint committees which would assist in finding jobs and providing needed relief.[39] Some years later (1928) reports that between three and four million were unemployed occasioned The Lutheran to make rather extensive comment upon the responsibility of society to those who were unemployed through no fault of their own, but because of technological changes. The remedy offered was a combination of individual thrift and avoidance of extravagance, with relief by society when whole trades were affected.[40]

The immediate and continuing reaction of writers within the Church to the problem of unemployment in the 1930's was to urge congregations to provide relief to the limit of their ability to do so. At the end of 1930, The Lutheran sent out an inquiry to pastors to determine what was actually being done in congregations about this problem. Most of the pastors reported that they saw no improvement in the general economic situation, but expressed a determination to lessen suffering by cooperation and generous giving. Commenting on this survey, an editorial pointed out that the Lutheran Church is directly interested in the everyday life of its members. "Let no critic of Lutheran conservatism," it stated, "indulge in the observation that we are more interested in the preservation of sound doctrines than in the ministry of mercy."[41]

It can be stated positively that the chief reaction of the Church to the problem of unemployment was an ameliorative one. This was a part of the "works of mercy" which the Church must show.

Although it was first thought that the problem of unemployment would be solved by an outpouring of relief on the part of religious and secular agencies on a local level, it was not long before some writers began to perceive the magnitude of the problem and to call upon the government to take adequate measures for relief. In the third year of the economic crisis, one man wrote:

> The unmistakable evidence now points to the certainty that unless the tide turns early in the year and comprehensive relief measures are translated into life necessities, there will be wholesale hunger on an unprecedented scale before the end of the year. There has been systematic propaganda against adequate relief programs - the assumption being that present local measures are adequate. In spite of the fact that the contrary has been proved, constructive action based on facts is withheld.[42]

These calls for more adequate relief measures, however, were seldom given very specific content.

Injustices arising from the situation of widespread unemployment were dealt with occasionally in terms of warning by The Lutheran. One editorial, for example, warned against the practice of exploiting labor simply because it is plentiful. "The sentiment is widespread," it stated, "that employers... are shoving the bulk of their adversity upon their workers. In the long run, equity will prevail. Either justice is done gradually or it is accomplished by violence. If there is a conspiracy to make the average man and the average woman the sole victim of hard times, the conspirators will surely be caught in their own trap...."[43] Another editorial warned against "sweatshops" that were

in existence, particularly among women and children. It suggested that Christian citizens refuse to patronize such places and also that they seek protective legislation. "Beyond the economic dangers," the editor wrote, "involved in tyranny and injustice practiced upon a section of society helpless under unemployment, the Christian citizen recognizes the command of God. He does not suffer persecution without limit."[44]

During the 1930's, most of the thinking and energy of the Church was used up in seeking to minister to the victims of unemployment. The amelioration of the lot of individuals was the burden of most of the articles directed toward this subject. Not many went beyond the immediate problem of unemployment to inquire into the causes of the Depression itself.

The legislation of the mid 1930's prompted by the so called "New Deal" administration marked a kind of turning point for the economic system of the United States. Whereas up to that time the essential system of the country had been a laissez-faire capitalism in which the government played primarily a protective role, since that time it has been increasingly a controlled capitalism in which the government plays a more and more regulative role in economic processes. Although the writers of the U.L.C.A. did not deal at all with the philosophy that lay behind this revolution of the economic system, they did give, albeit with occasional warnings, tentative approval to almost all of the initial steps.

When the National Industrial Recovery Act was passed in 1933, the immediate reaction of <u>The Lutheran</u> was favorable. Recognizing the fact that the nation would be calling upon all agencies within society,

including the Church, it was maintained that the Church should provide the moral impetus for this reform program:

> Citizens of the United States who belong to Lutheran congregations will expect their Church to maintain the correct and the long-established principles of distinction between the spheres of the Church and the State as to the political and economic plans proposed to achieve industrial recovery. As a group we will not prescribe legislation nor invade the realm of civil authority. On the other hand, our pastors, teachers and leaders will recognize that the powers that be are ordained of God, that activity as good citizens is the duty as well as the privilege of the believer and that our Lord's teaching and example supply both precepts and obligations bearing on the nation's efforts to reduce poverty and distress. Whatever the Gospel reveals to us concerning social righteousness, economic helpfulness and conscientious regard for our fellowmen's welfare must be plainly presented to the people in order that each of them may intelligently obey God at this time. The government is asking for a great public movement that shall line up an uncomparable majority of the population in behalf of industrial rehabilitation. In our opinion, our religion should be a powerful factor in the individual's decision to join that majority.45

The annual meeting of the editors of Lutheran publications and managers of Lutheran publication houses also went on record in 1933 as favoring this act. This association stated "that it heartily joins in supporting the N.I.R.A. and that it urges upon its constituencies likewise as Christian citizens to encourage our government by giving it their assistance in prayer, word and action, in sincere hope that it will accomplish its aim."[46]

When the Supreme Court declared the N.R.A. unconstitutional, The Lutheran took a second look at the act. It still liked the intent of the legislation although it agreed that it would be unwise to violate the constitution even to secure some good practical results. It pointed out, however, that this legislation had been the result of two specific realities which still had to be dealt with, namely, widespread unemployment

and "the relations of labor to capital (which) had long been such as would permit a minority of employers to indulge in unfair practices."[47] It was because of this that the people "made the demand that their government should come to their defence, a last resort of the victims of ruthless exploitation."[48] The final judgment of this editorial on the whole situation was:

> Legal enforcement of codifying employment is not an ideal way to reach the goal before the economic life of this age. But some way must be found. We commend the Golden Rule to the earnest study of capital and labor. Proper thought of one's neighbor and healthy contempt for unfair practices will create a public sentiment more powerful than N.R.A. and entirely constitutional.[49]

Recognition was given to the fact that a kind of social revolution had come to this country in an article by Dr. W.H. Greever. He recognized the fact that an extreme individualism in economic affairs was giving place to socialization. Perceiving that economic emergency was behind such a trend, he still felt that such socialization was both inevitable and good. It was up to the Church by practicing genuine Christian brotherhood, genuine Christian stewardship and evangelization to see that this process was Christianized. To be sure, this socialization was a general thing and did not inevitably issue in any particular kind of economic system.In fact, he made it clear that socialism was for him a distasteful alternative.

> Unchristian socialization always tends to be an "ism" - socialism, communism, etc., and an "ism" is nearly always a mark of a defect. There is a vast difference between a "socialized life" and "socialism". Socialized life is a free life for the individual which is lived in voluntary regard for the highest welfare and happiness of all men. Socialism is a theory of a common life promoted by a system under which the individual life is subordinated, by rule,

> for the promotion of a mythical "common life," impersonated, by necessity, in a dictator or a bureau. The Christian religion, and therefore the Christian Church, stand for the former....50

The welfare legislation of the "New Deal," was attractive to The Lutheran from some points of view, yet called forth several warnings. The proposal for Old Age Pensions, for example, resulted in the caution that they might serve to be destructive of a religious view of the family in which children owe support for their parents in old age. Likewise, unemployment insurance could militate against the virtues of industry, thrift and abstention from intemperate habits.[51] It was not thought, however, that these were sufficient arguments against having such legislation, but rather that Christian citizens should keep such arguments in mind as they observed such welfare legislation.

Thus, the reaction of writers in the U.L.C.A. to "New Deal" legislation was a general acceptance of that legislation as a way in which some of the inequities in the economic order could be smoothed out. A few misgivings were expressed, but these were overcome by the obvious economic necessity.

Once the Depression was over, practically no consideration was given in the church periodicals either to welfare legislation or to the new role of government in economic processes. In 1947, however, the editor of The Lutheran expressed himself as feeling that the government must take part in economic processes largely because of the selfishness of both labor and management:

> This is a time when the free-enterprise system is under severe trial. It would seem to me logical that the masterminds of this system in America would do their best to make it work. Instead, they are collecting quick profits

as though they don't care what happens tomorrow.

I don't expect very much logic from the labor unions. Men who live on their weekly paychecks are not in good position to think far ahead. Union policy is merely the reverse-side of management policy anyhow.

Since it is fairly conclusive that neither management nor labor intends to work for the general welfare, it becomes the duty of government to act on behalf of all of us....62

One of the characteristic features of the economic order in the period 1918-1948 was the development of the labor union movement. After the first World War there was a great deal of industrial unrest which affected some of America's basic industries such as the railroads, coal and steel. During this time there was a great deal of bickering between labor and management, with management, more often than not, being in the best bargaining position. The legislation of the mid 1930's, particularly the National Labor Relations Act, gave a great impetus to the establishment of labor unions as a dominant factor in the economic order. Since that time they have continued in strength.

What was the reaction of the U.L.C.A. to the labor union movement and to industrial unrest? From the very beginning, all published articles expressed themselves as being in favor of the labor union movement. Although some practices of labor unions are sharply criticized, there is a general unanimity of opinion that labor unions have a right to exist and develop.

In 1919, Dr. Franklin Fretz, looked with favor upon the contribution made by trade unions to the economic health of the nation. "The spirit of trade unionism", he said,"instead of being that of class struggle, is the spirit of partnership. Trade unionism is based upon the principle of partnership which we see in the home. It has organized

itself to get a larger share of profits by negotiation, by agreement, by strikes."[53] Analyzing the part played by the unions in the war, he wrote: "The trade unions saved us. Next to our armies going to France the greatest asset of our country has been the way the trade unions have acted in our national crises."[54] In the same year, The Lutheran showed its interest in unions by publishing a summary of the program looking toward comprehensive legislation which had been adopted by the American Federation of Labor.[55]

The Lutheran deplored the attempt on the part of some companies to break up labor unions. Its argument was that under present conditions workmen need unions in order to attain justice. "...We... have the sincere conviction," stated the editorial,

> that organized labor must not be reduced to individualism at this time. Industrial conditions are not ideal and labor leaders are not always wise. Strikes often fail because they are ill advised. But economic history for the past hundred years indicates that a certain percentage of employers treat workmen as mere commodities; that capital tends toward combinations, and that relief for injustice and higher industrial ideals have come from labor organization, which could make demands and win them. That conducting business by the Golden Rule of Christ would eradicate much economic suffering, we agree. But the Golden Rule has not yet been adopted, and unions must continue to defend the equities of workmen.56

Again and again, articles and editorials deplored the exploitation of labor or the regarding of it as simply a commodity.[57]

While recognizing the necessity and accomplishments of labor unions, there were certain things about this movement that some writers did not like. Violence was one of them. Although admitting the right to strike, the too frequent use of this right was deplored. This was particularly true when violence was used. This was not attributed,

however, solely to labor unions, but to capital and the community as well.[58] Strikes which affected large masses of the population were particularly brought into question. These were deplored both as a threat to the sovereignty of the United States government[59] and because they caused too much suffering among innocent people.[60] In view of this suffering, it was the opinion of an editorial in The Lutheran that legislation should be secured. "It is our candid opinion," it stated, "that Christian citizens fail to do their duty by their apathetic subjection to widespread strikes and lockouts. Legislatures and Congress can stop such, as logically as they forbid dueling, and just as soon as the voters order it done...."[61] Another grievance against labor unions was the radical leadership of some and their attitude toward the Church. "What hurts labor", stated an editorial,

> is its radical socialists. Recently one of them addressed a large audience in one of our eastern cities and he vented his spleen on the Church by saying, "To hell with the Church." Something of a mob was in attendance and they applauded. In the eyes of the Christians of the city, this official of a union did labor a grievous harm; for it made them ask, is labor satisfied to follow a leadership like that? If so, what confidence can we have that it will remain true to principles of righteousness and justice such as the Christian religion stands for? Let labor part company with radicals.62

Because of what industrial unrest in basic industries could do to the economy of the country as a whole, The Lutheran felt that the government must play an important part in these industries. In a coal dispute, for example, it gave its approval to price fixing by the government as a way to compel operators to be satisfied with a reasonable profit.[63] When it came to the railroads, another editorial expressed its belief in public control."...Effective public control of so mighty a public utility," it stated, "is the only real reply to, and substitute

for, public ownership. A railroad is too big and powerful an institution to leave entirely unwatched and unrestrained in its relation to its more or less helpless individual customers. This is common ground. We are all agreed on it."[64]

It is interesting to note that most of the references to labor unions were made during the 1920's while there is scarcely a mention of them in the following decade. It was mostly the industrial disputes of the 1920's that attracted the attention of U.L.C.A. writers to the unions. In the 1930's, of course, widespread unemployment militated against the power of labor unions. Moreover, the writers of the U.L.C.A. were thoroughly absorbed with the problems of unemployment. Whatever the cause, there is no discussion in U.L.C.A. literature in the 1930's of labor unions or of national legislation pertaining to unions.

The 1940's saw a revival of interest in the labor union movement. With their newly won power, labor unions had become one of the most important groups in determining the character of our political and economic life. Many church leaders were disturbed at the antagonism that existed in the ranks of labor toward the Church and looked for ways to establish better understanding. Various articles sought to explain the aims of labor to church members. Dr. A.D. Mattson pointed out that the right of labor to organize is not simply a legal right, but also a moral one. He stated that it is only through labor unions that it is possible to have any kind of democracy in industry. It was his feeling that "unless the Church gives guidance to labor there will be danger in the labor movement. That danger may be averted if the Church will seek to make its voice and spirit felt in the ranks of labor." In

order to accomplish this, he urged that the Church seek to develop a sympathetic understanding of the problems and needs of the laboring man.[65]

To arrive at a common understanding, schools and seminars on labor[66] were promoted under U.L.C.A. auspices, reports on the conventions of labor unions were given and the attendance of pastors at labor union meetings and conventions was urged by the Board of Social Missions.

Labor unions have been given some attention by The Lutheran in recent years. An article, published in 1946, asks the question, "Are Labor Unions Justified?" After analyzing the situation which the individual worker faces under modern conditions, this author's conclusion was that "our type of culture seems to demand and justify the organization of workers, both skilled and unskilled, as the best procedure through which they may secure, defend, and advance their inherent rights in a highly centralized and closely organized industrial order."[68]

One pastor, the Rev. Rufus R. Cornelsen, has maintained an active interest in industrial problems. The Lutheran published a full account of his enthusiastic reaction to a C.I.O. convention. His appraisal[69] was that although there was not much theorizing on the point, the actions of the convention were very much in harmony with the Christian ethic. He was impressed by the lack of discrimination in respect of race, color, creed, class, sex, or national origin, by the constant demands for justice, and by the emphasis upon freedom, especially in the sense of material welfare. Moreover, he said he discovered a real sense of mission among the top officials of the C.I.O. Some of

them had been directly influenced by the Church in choosing their life's work. He recognized the fact of indifference on the part of many labor leaders to the Church but attributed it to an antagonistic attitude which the Church had taken toward labor. Pointing up the inactivity of his own Church in this sphere he said: "Several times I heard the statement made by various individuals that the Lutheran Church of all Protestant churches seems to be the least interested in the temporal welfare of man."[70]

Concerning this report, the editor of The Lutheran called attention to the fact that "...there has been an upswing in fervor regarding the unions. Pastor Cornelsen's report of the C.I.O. convention called forth sharp comments."[71] Three letters were published which protested vehemently against Cornelsen's article. One denied that actions of the C.I.O. were so much in harmony with Christian ethics and inquired whether Cornelsen was a propagandist for the C.I.O.? Another, out of the experience of having a strike in his own city, protested that many labor leaders "...want to force their ideas down everyone's throat. And where they cannot do so, they go insane and wreck and destroy like crazy maniacs."[72] The third asked: "Is it Christian to make millions suffer for the benefit of a few? Is it Christian to resort to violence to enforce the will of a few against men who are trying to do the right thing? Is it Christian to punish the man who has worked hard and built up a business, and take away the profits of his labor by force or strategy? Is it Christian to try to intimidate and control the government? ...Let's have no more of such worldly talk in The Lutheran. Big-city outlook has blinded its eyes to true religion and to the true nature of God and of His Church...."[73]

These reactions are important because they show that among the rank and file of church membership there was a sharp division of opinion concerning labor unions. This opposition or antagonism simply does not appear in any of the formal writings of the church periodicals. Yet the sharp reaction to anything which sought to glorify labor unions in any specific terms shows that it was in existence.

As Congress moved to amend the "Wagner Act" by adopting the so-called "Taft-Hartley Act", the Washington column of The Lutheran gave its reaction. It called for legislation which would be corrective and not punitive. The belief was stated that labor unions should be compelled to incorporate and to render reports to their memberships and perhaps also to the government. The question was asked whether or not the anti-trust laws should also apply to labor? Moreover, labor courts were advocated.[74]

With the coming labor legislation in mind, The Lutheran published an article by the Rev. Paul Trout which sought to give the background of the Labor Movement and which sympathetically set forth the aims of labor. This article sought to analyze in realistic fashion the duty of the Church toward labor:

> Should the church be concerned about labor? Many will say, "Let it rather be concerned with the laboring man. The church should feel deep concern for the laboring man's soul. But the problems of the laboring man are matters for him to work out. They should not concern the church."
>
> This in theory is good. In practice it has its difficulties. It is almost impossible to be concerned about the man and not the man's problems. The battle that the working man is fighting is not just a battle of wages and "social security". It is a battle that involves his soul as well.75

Pastor Trout goes on to point out that a man's spiritual life is conditioned by his environmental conditions, particularly his working

conditions. As a part of its concern for men's souls, it is therefore necessary for the Church to interest itself in such conditions.

This article also brought forth a number of comments from readers,[76] both for and against. This reveals that the issue was one that members of the Church were disturbed about. It also shows that they had differing opinions concerning it. One accused Pastor Trout of being too pro-union and stated its belief that the Church cannot be a "divider of goods."

We have now observed the expressed attitude of the U.L.C.A. through its periodicals, to the labor union movement and to industrial unrest. Almost without exception the various articles have declared themselves as being in favor of the principle of labor union organization as something necessary under present industrial conditions. When it came to specific practices of unions, however, there is something of a difference of opinion. Some articles tended to glorify labor unions; others questioned their right to strike when that meant inflicting suffering upon large masses of innocent people or when that constituted a threat to the sovereignty of the United States government or to the general economy of the nation. Violence was also thoroughly condemned, and there was constant urging that better ways be found for settling industrial disputes. The U.L.C.A. was disturbed by the indifference or antagonism of many labor unions toward the Church. Generally speaking, it felt that this was because labor union leaders did not understand the Church, but still it sought to do everything possible to provide some kind of common understanding. This is especially true in later years. We have also pointed out that although published articles definitely

put the U.L.C.A. on the side of labor unions, at least in principle, there is evidence in the reactions given to some of these articles that members of the Church were not at all unanimous in this position.

Let us turn now to examine some of the criticisms of the economic system given by writers within the U.L.C.A. In the 1920's these were very few. Some were occasioned by industrial conflict. In no case, however, was the economic system itself questioned, but rather certain practices within the system. Most of these criticisms were given in terms of generalities.[77] A new conscience in business was called for. A new conception which looked upon industry as a form of social service was advocated.[78] General statements criticizing conflict between capital and labor and advocating cooperation were issued.[79]

The widespread unemployment of the 1930's, however, with its attendant hardships, did cause occasional serious criticism of the economic system as such. One theological professor sought to project the spirit and activities of Martin Luther into a criticism of modern business. He wrote:

> Luther himself was not a business specialist, but if he were to come back to the world of modern business, it is certain that he would have some vigorous words of admonition for us. He would point out many a weakness in our present economic system. And he would have some very practical suggestions to heal the moral rift in the modern world, to close the cultural fracture in modern society. He would continue to be interested primarily in the welfare of the common man and he would be strongly opposed to any kind of special privilege. He would demand a more equal distribution of the products of labor, and would point out that there is no enduring wealth that is not commonwealth. He would denounce the rapacity of many of our money magnates and out captains of industry. He would encourage the growing sense of social responsibility which he would discern in many branches of industry today.80

Another writer sought to enlist the aid of the Church totally on

the side of the exploited. "The masses," he wrote, "will have their rightful share of the products of industry, and they will have it as a matter of right, not as a concession. A system that 'devours widow's houses and for a pretense' patronizes art and learning will wreck any civilization. The eternal God has spoken it."[81]

The profit motive received a share of criticism as the dominant motive of our economic system. "Whatever can be said," wrote one author, "about the good that the love of money or the profit motive has produced, it has also produced a lot of bad. Whatever is its relationship to the good in our social order, it is, too, a source of evil. All religious groups in America have come to the place where they refuse to be confused about that any longer."[82] It should be noted that this author was not dealing with the profit motive in a strictly economic sense (although he probably thought he was), for he equated it with the love of money. In spite of his indictment of the profit motive, he did not feel that capitalism ought, therefore, to be overthrown. Rather he felt that capitalism ought to be controlled, and as soon as this is done the basis of the social order will be shifted from the profit motive to social good.[83]

The most outspoken article against the capitalistic system from the viewpoint of Christian ethics is one entitled, "The Church's Strategy for Survival." Without proposing what form the economic system should take, the author criticizes capitalism severely and advocates that:

> ...The church should dessicate (sic) its Christ and itself from the unjust pre-war economic status quo. This status quo includes both the economic inequity within and among the nations and also the economic system by which this inequity has been continually

> aggravated. (1) The first reason for dissociating the church from the economic status quo is that the imperialist capitalist system is eminently guilty in this war. (2) But long before this war broke out again, it was widely being questioned whether Christianity as a way of life can be fitted into modern capitalist civilization without intolerable strain, and whether Christianity is not by its very nature committed to work and to pray for a new economic order. The recent Malvern resolution of the church of England reflects widespread and important Christian conviction in this regard, for the call for a radically reorganized economy that was sounded at Malvern was based on a penetrating criticism of the anti-Christian character of twentieth century capitalism.84

Although the general restlessness that was abroad in the nation under the rigors of the Depression is reflected in a number of the articles by U.L.C.A. writers, there is not much specific criticism of the economic system as such. With only one exception, as has been noted above, the capitalistic system was universally defended in principle, although most writers felt that changes had to be made within its structure. One author, for example, dealt with the dominant motive behind the use of profit:

> There can be no reasonable quarrel with profit in industry. A certain amount is requisite. But the Christian principle denies profit as the real motive. That industry must offer great material rewards to stimulate great endeavor accords with economic theory, but not with Christian teaching. To serve the needs of men as a conscious steward of what belongs to God should be the purpose of industry. Service, not profit, comes first in an industry that bears the stamp of the Carpenter.85

Most writers, after criticizing certain aspects of our economic order, advocated some sort of controlled capitalism that would obviate the evils. Dr. William H. Stackel, for example, gave capitalism a vote of confidence, but believed it should be restrained. "Amputation or correction - which is our 'profit system's need?" He answers his own question thus:

> I vote for correction, firmly believing that amputation will likely kill the patient, or at least will subject it to a whole crop of new and more serious ills from which it may never recover. I vote unreservedly for preserving a system that has brought mankind to the very threshold of universal prosperity. I believe that whatever ills exist, and they are truly many and serious, can be overcome in great measure by the proper approach. Of course, as long as we have ourselves to deal with we can never hope for perfection, no matter under what system we operate.86

Yet he does not feel that this system can under modern conditions be allowed to function without public restraint:

> Let us frankly acknowledge that a "profit system" which in great measure is unrestrained and unrestricted is no longer tolerable or defensible. Under the complexities of modern society economic interdependence is the most obvious fact with which we have to deal.... Today, almost every policy adopted by a businessman has an effect for good or ill upon society. The conscientious Christian cannot endorse any economic system which would allow business to run amuck. Business must be conducted in all cases so as to benefit the common lot of man. Our "profit system" must be conducted so as to render effective the Golden Rule. On the other hand individual genius and initiative must not be stifled.87

With this in mind, what then was the reaction of U.L.C.A. writers to proposed substitutes for the capitalistic system, namely, communism, fascism and socialism? Almost without exception they were condemned although with varying degrees of fervor. Communism received the largest share of denunciation while socialism was given only passing attention. These systems, however, were practically never considered from an economic point of view, but rather from the point of view of their effect upon religion and the Church. This type of treatment was deliberate and in accord with the conviction that economic theory as such is outside the province of the Church. The editor of The Lutheran, for example, sought justification for including articles on political and economic subjects in a church paper in the following words:

> It is proper to remind the reader that the query back of these articles is the propriety of the church press presenting a discussion of Communism, Fascism, and the antagonist of both, at present Capitalism. If it were possible to keep these forms of government strictly within the realm of civil authority, and if there were no connection between religion and government, then there would be no reason on account of which church papers should deal with any of them. But in a free government such as that of the United States and Canada the churchman is a citizen and the citizen ought to be a churchman. The state can be kept in safe paths only when its principles of justice and mercy accord with those known through Christ and where the propagation of these principles is not subjected to partisan expediency. Only thus is the citizen's religion enabled to contribute to the perpetuation of his nation.88

Throughout the life of the U.L.C.A., communism, or Bolshevism as it was called in the early years, received a great deal of attention in the pages of The Lutheran. Throughout the various developments of the period 1918-1948, the tone of these articles was universally hostile. We shall simply examine a few of these in order to understand the basis for opposition. While communism was still struggling for its life in Soviet Russia, an editorial warned against its dangers. These dangers were seen to be such things as the method of revolution, godlessness and hostility to the Church and radical ideas on the division of labor and sex distinctions. Moreover, communism was said to be ambitious of world dominion.[89]

When the question of recognition of Soviet Russia by the United States came up, The Lutheran was opposed to this step, not only on the basis of the opposition of communism to religion, but also on the basis of its fundamental theory:

> To base the Constitution of a government on economic environment rather than on character ideals, seems to us a step backward in time and downward in the scale

> of civilization. The American Declaration of Independence and our Constitution were revolutionary and successful protests against economic slavery. They claimed for mankind liberty of conscience, opportunity for character training, and idealism in spiritual spheres. Thus they rose above the wage situation which an era of colonization had produced in Europe and North America. The present age is one of manufacture and commerce rather than one of colonization, and it has its own wage problem. But to make this single phase of twentieth century life the only determinative factor in the theory of the state is to go back to the political theories of the Bourbons, George III and their contemporaries of 1760. Slavery, be it to a class, an individual or to the government, is nonetheless slavery.90

During the 1930's, The Lutheran was increasingly concerned with the growing menace of communism under the conditions of unemployment which were abroad in the country. Commenting on this, an editorial condemns the Soviet Union on religious grounds. Pointing out that the American Lutheran Church had refrained from passing judgment on the civic principles of communism, the editor also wrote that as long as Russia was going to make of its government an antagonist to God and religion, then Christians would inevitably be opposed to that phase of its system.[91]

The opposing nature of the choice that was given to people by communism was presented clearly in its alternatives by Dr. E.P. Pfatteicher. He stated that the citizens of the United States must choose between "Luther and Lenin; between Christ and Anti-Christ; between God and Baal; between spiritual leadership and material leadership; between the Savior of men's souls and the pretending Savior of men's bodies; between the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and the kingdom of this world and its snares."[92]

Recognizing the messianic spirit of communism, Dr. Paul A. Krauss pointed out that only the Christian Church is adequate to cope with it. He then went on to analyze why communism is evil. The evil of its

anti-religious character is taken for granted. The criticism is directed to two false theories of communism, the first, "that mankind is motivated wholly by material and economic forces." The second, "is the conviction with respect to surplus values."[93]

As, in the 1940's, Russia became an ally of the United States in war, and then an opponent in a developing "cold war", The Lutheran continued to express suspicion of its aims. In 1941, the Washington column contained a pertinent prediction:

> It is our opinion that trying to prove the existence of constitutional religious liberty in Russia is like finding a safe place for a child to play on Constitution Avenue, Washington. It just does'nt exist. We hope the President may be successful in using the emergency to do something constructive for social freedom in Russia. But the four freedoms, in our judgment, can never live under Uncle Joe Stalin. If religious liberty really comes, his sort of communism must go. Our only approval of Russia is that she is doing at this writing a marvelous job of slowing down Hitler. Let it go at that, Mr. President. He might be a strange bed-fellow later on.94

These articles, then, give the character of Lutheran opposition to communism.[95] Suffice it to say that throughout the years its opposition has been consistent and universal.

Fascism received very little attention in the church periodicals. Although this became the political and economic system of Italy in the 1920's, it was not particularly considered a threat to world safety until its advent in Germany in 1933. Moreover, its antagonism to Christianity and the Church was not as readily apparent as was the case with communism. Nowhere is any consideration given to it as an economic system. The general attitude of the U.L.C.A. can be seen in the fact that reference to it is usually made in connection with communism and

it received the same general condemnation. The danger of fascism as it was seen by the editor of The Lutheran lay in the fact that it "...requires a regimentation of the content of religion and of the organization of the church that will bring about sooner or later a complete subordination of spiritual to civil authority. This both limits spiritual freedom, and claims for the state a sphere of control for which the state lacks the necessary prerogatives."[96]

The attitude of church writers toward socialism was one of opposition, but this system did not evoke quite the same tone of hostility as did communism, or fascism. Since, up until the end of our study period, socialism (except in its communistic form) had not become the economic system of any major power, it did not seem to represent as pressing a problem as some of the other systems already mentioned.

In 1920, The Lutheran declared itself as against government ownership of the railroads.[97] Likewise, an article declared itself as being against the nationalization of the coal industry (although it did state that government control is preferable to what almost amounts to banditry in that industry.)[98]

The attitude expressed by an editorial in The Lutheran in 1920 leaves no doubt that socialists should be opposed:

> ...There are socialists and socialists. All are not necessarily next-door neighbors to anarchists, as some would have us believe. Many are loyal citizens and have the welfare of the country at heart, whether their theories work out to that end or not. Others again are of the radical type, and if their theories were adopted, democracy would not be safe for America. They may not advocate force or the overthrow of government by unlawful means, but the logic of their thinking points that way. Without knowing it, they often play into the hands of anarchists - and no democracy can stand anarchists.

> And yet both are with us. What shall we do with them? Invite them to come into the open. Reason with them. Educate them. Do not drive them to their secret lairs, where, embittered, they are bound to hatch trouble. If reason, persuasion, education fail, there is only one course open, and that is to pronounce them as enemies of the country and to warn them against the consequences of both their teachings and their actions. But the Church is not here to do this. It is here to plead, persuade and warn. Further than that it cannot go.99

It was the materialistic center of socialism that Dr. John Haas objected to strenuously. He was speaking particularly of the socialism which had its roots in Marx, but he seemed to feel that from a Christian point of view, there was something in the very nature of all socialism that was unredeemable. Even though his criticism is not very profound, it does establish an attitude:

> Socialism... is selfish while claiming to be democratic. It serves only a single class and fosters class hatred. Even where men have endeavored to prefix the adjective Christian they have failed in redeeming the materialistic center of socialism. It started as an uncircumcised conception, and its baptism into Christianity has not succeeded. The more the Christian elements are emphasized the less the socialistic elements can remain. For Christianity the stomach is always secondary to the soul. The Christian will pray for his daily bread, but he also knows that man does not live by bread alone. Where these considerations rule, socialism will become considerably modified. But generally in so-called Christian socialism, the socialism destroys the Christian. It is after all not desirous of universal justice, but is a selfish theory of the organization of labor for its own end and advantage.100

Another writer, after attending a meeting of the Socialist Party in 1923, set down his impressions as essentially negative. He admitted that here was an element of truth in some of the accusations made at this meeting, namely, that there are serious ills in the social order, that capital has not always played fair with labor, that the courts have at times not been just, and that war is a horrible nightmare.

But he did not like the radicalism that he found in the Socialist Party. This party, it seemed to him, sought to attain its ends by revolution. This was to be accomplished without any thought of transforming both capitalists and workers. Moreover, he did not like the attacks on the Church which he heard at the meeting. Also, the Socialist Party seemed to be seeking justice for a limited group only. His final conclusion was that he could "not believe that Socialism holds out any hope for a better future either here or hereafter."[101]

An article in 1932 in The Lutheran reporting the ravages of unemployment in Toledo, Ohio, brought forth an exchange of letters which reveal different attitudes toward basic economic systems and toward the duty of the Church as well. The original article after speaking of the hardships occasioned by unemployment, contained the statement: "While we may not be able to offer financial assistance or food, we can so preach the gospel that hearts and minds will be kept from socialistic and communistic thoughts. In our own parish we hope to conduct a mission of evangelism for two weeks and to keep the minds of our parishioners staid upon God's providential love...."[102]

A letter from Pastor Shumaker protested against ever preaching the Gospel in order "that hearts and minds will be kept from socialistic and communistic thoughts." Moreover, the tone of this letter was friendly at least to the attempts that socialism and communism were making to improve conditions. "I do not see," wrote the author,

> how the Gospel of Jesus can be arrayed against any attempts at social betterment. That at heart both socialism and communism seek to better the conditions of the down-trodden and oppressed is perfectly evident. If that ideal is contrary to the spirit of

> Jesus Christ, then I have never known my Lord. The least that the church could do is to refuse to put unnecessary obstacles in the way of such a purpose.... Shall we become the defenders of a capitalism that has tumbled in miserable ruins about our heads? God forbid. We cannot do it and still remain true to the spirit of Him who said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[103]

This same author indicted the role of the Church by saying that the Church cannot salve its conscience by its Inner Mission work."...It can be nothing more than a great hypocrisy," he wrote, "if we are content to bind up a few broken bodies and soothe a few broken hearts while we become the defenders of the social system that has helped to crush those bodies and break those hearts."[104]

In response to this, another letter agreed with some of the general principles which Pastor Shumaker had advanced in so far as the duty of the Church is concerned, but objected strenuously to the claim that both Socialism and Communism are seeking to better the condition of the down-trodden and oppressed. It was stated that Socialism and Communism, instead of being the arch enemies of oppression are its leading exponents. For that reason alone, both of them ought to be opposed.[105]

Here, then, are the reactions of U.L.C.A. writers to various economic systems. To summarize briefly, we must say that there was some criticism of capitalism, occasioned in the 1920's by industrial conflict, and in the 1930's by the Depression. This criticism, however, was neither abundant nor far-reaching. The Church seemed to confine itself more to a concern for the victims of a breakdown of the system than to a profound analysis of the system itself. Almost universally, those who criticized capitalism called for a reform <u>within</u> the system rather than for its destruction. With only one or two exceptions (and even

these were not proposals for a specific substitute system but simply a condemnation of capitalism), the alternative systems of communism, fascism and socialism were condemned. This, however, was not done on economic grounds (the judgment of which the Church considered to be outside of its province), but on religious grounds. There is no question but that throughout the years of prosperity, depression and war, the U.L.C.A. has supported the capitalistic system.

We come now to the final question of this chapter, namely what was the conception of the U.L.C.A. of the function of the Church in relation to problems of the economic order? We have, of course, been touching on this point in the previous pages, but it is advisable that we discuss it here more specifically.

In the first place, the writers of the U.L.C.A. quite generally believed that the Church had not been established "to be a divider of goods." Just as Christ refused to divide the inheritance but pointed the antagonists to their deeper motives, so the Church cannot allow herself to become entangled in the many disputes of men concerning economic possessions, but must always deal with something more fundamental. This did not mean, however, that the Church had no interest in the problems of the economic order. Rather, it was believed that as the Church gave herself to basic principles, these principles would serve as guides for the establishment of justice in the economic order. "The task of the church," wrote one author, "is to measure conditions and tendencies by the rule of Jesus Christ. It is that of the prophet.... How do the methods of American industry and commerce square with the Lord's righteous precepts? How does the quality and amount of the

worker's work meet the test?..."[106]

At a time in which industrial unrest was plaguing the nation, The Lutheran recognized the inability of the Church to act as a judge in industrial disputes, both because of the technical incompetence of the Church and also because the Church would then be infringing upon the domain of the State. In spite of that, the Church could not stand idly by, but must proclaim the basic principles of justice which had to operate on both sides in all industrial disputes.[107] In a similar vein, another editorial states its belief that the Church cannot possibly unravel the tangle of labor disputes and still remain the Church. "The Church," this editorial states, "must keep strictly within its sphere of preaching from the housetops its Gospel of the Golden Rule. It must launch its warfare against the god of Mammon. It must cry out as did the prophets of old against the greed, the injustice and the inhumanity which is making countless thousands mourn...."[108]

The Lutheran had little patience with those who would have the Church go outside of its own province in order to settle industrial disputes, but it was just as impatient with those who accused the Church of not caring about the situation. The following editorial is about as clear an exposition of this particular conception of the duty of the Church as can be found in U.L.C.A. literature:

> ...the Lutheran Church does not naturally undertake as a Church to decide the merits of economic controversies. Its position, however, is not that of a neutral; neutrals are those in between and inert. Neither our conception of Christianity nor our policy as a church can be described as indifferent or "in between". It is much more accurate to say that we are underneath both parties to the dissension. Any injustice to labor intensifies the hardships of his home and of himself; of course the Church feels with the

> worker as well as for him. Equally aggravating is the disturbance of orderly production by strikes and destruction of life and property. This is not favoritism for vested wealth but perception of the passions aroused by bitter and often bloody quarrels. Yet even here the Church can rarely even advise, let alone compel adjustments, because its prerogatives as an arbiter are lacking....
>
> We believe it is true that clergymen discuss the next life much more than they do this one. And what else can they do? What else should they do? The next life is of more importance than this one, and patience is a virtue. But while the sensible clergyman is aware of this inability to adjust differences between employers and employed, he does know of the arbitrament of God. He rarely withholds the proclamation of those higher principles of human relationships that are of divine creation and have divine, enforcement. Neither labor nor capital can afford indifference to these principles nor to the fellowship of believers by which they are heralded and applied to the individuals of society without regard to partisanship.109

The President of the U.L.C.A. in 1919, indicated his recognition of the important place of labor in the world today. "...There are important respects," he wrote, "in which this age may be designated as an age of labor. The cause of labor has assumed a commanding and controlling interest. Its purposes cannot be neglected, for they reach into the fundamental structure of all national existence. Labor is thinking world thoughts, and compellingly insists that they be universally adopted."[110] Because of this, he called for more attention to labor on the part of the Church lest the Church fail to preach a living Gospel. In his treatment of the subject, however, he makes it clear that the Church ought simply to advance <u>principles</u> which can be applied to labor.[111] In an address in 1931, he emphasized a similar idea: "The Church, like Jesus," he said, "cannot be a petty judge amid the wrangles of men for possessions, but with its fundamental and distinct human principles it can provide welcome and inspiring light

for the furtherance of the labor movement...."[112]

This type of thinking, which is simply the application to a specific problem of something which we have already developed in Section II, has played a rather important role in the U.L.C.A. thereby keeping it from participating directly in economic affairs. This same sort of thinking was usually applied, at least in theory, to the Church's consideration of alternative economic systems. One writer pointed out that it is the fact of sin that is at the heart of all difficulties in economic relationships. Consequently, the fundamental duty of the Church is to show men this root cause and bring them to repentance.[113] Another writer stressed the same point of view as this applied to various economic systems:

> The fundamental task of the Church from an ethical point of view is the transformation of the inner life, through the preaching and application of the Gospel of repentance and faith. With systems and voluntary forms of organization the Church is not concerned. From the Christian point of view, it is immaterial whether men live under a monarchy or a democracy, whether they organize their business along capitalistic or socialistic lines. What the Church is always interested in is the human factor. Her warfare is not with systems but with sin. New forms of organization are bound to appear in a civilization which is progressive; and from the purely political or economic point of view the new may represent an advance over the old. But from the human point of view the old problem of sin will remain. There will always be need of the Church's message of repentance and faith....114

Whatever economic system the Christian Church found itself under, its basic task was to deal with the spirit that was behind that system. In the long run, this was the deciding factor as to whether any particular economic system would be just or unjust. Therefore, religion "will not be the sponsor of any system but the critic of them

all.... Religion...will fight the battle of no system but only the battle against the profit motive or the love of money which is the root of all evil in any system."[115]

Writers of the U.L.C.A. have almost universally recognized the fact that there is a strong moral element in the economic order. The idea that business could proceed along in a self justifying moral world, without benefit of religion, was severely scotched by The Lutheran.[116] As it has become increasingly apparent that the tendency in modern society is for many to compartmentalize ethics into "religious" and "economic" categories, individuals within the U.L.C.A. particularly within the last decade, have become increasingly impatient with generalizations by the Church in the field of economic life. There are increasing calls for the Church to gain a better understanding of economic forces and, on the basis of that understanding, to apply its message more specifically. "Some would have us believe," a study pamphlet states, "that Christianity is a thing entirely apart from the problems of wages, hours, working conditions and the like. In more recent years there is evidently a growing conviction that these conditions are subjects of Christian concern. They are human problems and Christianity is concerned with all that touches human life."[117]

Analyzing the economic factor in the genesis of Christianity, Dr. Stamm pointed out the interrelationship between religion and economics. "Those who in theory or in practice compartmentalize life," he wrote, "fail to observe that unless religious people mould economic conditions, economic conditions will either mould them or send them to a cross which might have been avoided. They fail to see that human

life is a unity of creative partnership with God and that while the motives of men in the production, distribution and use of economic goods are of primary importance, the economic system, which inevitably reacts upon motives, good or bad, either favorably or unfavorably , is also of primary - not secondary - importance. Both must be taken together and kept so...."[118] Consequently, he believed, that it was the duty of the Church to mass the spiritual and material resources of her members in order to strive to create a perfect social order on earth.[119]

Dr. Blackwelder, analyzing the actions of the 1936 convention of the U.L.C.A. was somewhat impatient with generalizations in the field of economic life. He called for a more diligent application of the Church to this important realm of living. "...A moral and sound economic order are inseparable," he wrote. If this is a moral universe, then the attack on economic problems must be a moral one.... The method of this attack should not be in general pronouncements nor alone in a recitation of principles.... Someone must keep society aware of the injustice, inequalities and lack of Christian brotherhood. This 'someone' is the church.[120] Continuing his analysis of statements of the convnetion pertaining to economic life, he wrote:

> The convention declared that the task of the church is to "proclaim principle" but this surely must mean to make such proclamations in the light of the example of Jesus and Martin Luther. Did they simply proclaim principle?
>
> It is true that there is power in the gospel to make society Christian, as the Moral and Social Welfare Committee reported, but how? We must be increasingly impatient with generalizations in a world of need like ours today.121

Concrete suggestions as to how the Church might serve more effectively

in this area were made in a number of places. One writer suggested that the Church could render effective service "by acting as the medium through which the representatives of capital and labor may arbitrate."[122] Another suggested that the Church ought to venture into the organized labor movement as the Roman Catholic Church has done. He wrote:

> ...What Lutheran pastors or representative laymen have been asked to sit on conciliation committees in labor disputes? ...What churchmen in coal-mining areas, for example, are competent enough students of social conditions there to testify at government hearings? ...How many churchmen in industrial centers like Baltimore, Pittsburgh and Detroit are acquainted personally with labor leaders? How many have been invited to address union meetings? ...Is the Church only an ambulance driver, or also here to tackle the causes that make the ambulance necessary?[123]

Still another suggestion was made that the Lutheran Church venture into the "labor school" type of program.[124] Actually, as we have previously mentioned, the U.L.C.A. has in recent years been conducting a few such schools in addition to seminars and institutes on problems relating to the economic order.[125]

We come now to an end of our survey of attitudes expressed by or within the U.L.C.A. on problems of the economic order. We pointed out, first of all, that the actions of the U.L.C.A. in convention assembled were very few. Moreover, most of these were exceedingly general in their formulation. The actions of Synods can also be included in a similar category. The U.L.C.A. did, however, adopt a statement on labor in 1948. While this, too, is rather general, the fact that it was adopted at all represents a significant change in the thinking of the Church as to its function with reference to the problems of the economic order.

The literature of the Church was surveyed, first of all, to see the reaction to various developments on the economic scene. There is virtually no published reaction to the prosperity and speculation of the 1920's. The unemployment of the 1930's received a great deal of attention but mostly in terms of urging relief. The Depression, itself, was seldom analyzed in any profound fashion. The initial reaction to the welfare legislation of the "New Deal" was essentially favorable although certain warnings were advanced. The labor union movement quite generally received the approval of writers within the Church since all of them seemed to recognize the necessity of labor union organization under modern industrial conditions. Yet ethical responsibility and a concern for the good of all were constantly urged upon labor unions and management alike. Industrial conflict was frequently deplored.

Criticisms of the economic system itself were occasionally heard, especially in the 1930's, but with only one or two exceptions, all the writers called for a reform within the system rather than its destruction. The alternative economic systems of socialism, fascism and communism (and particularly the latter) were quite universally condemned. This was, however, not on economic grounds, but for religious reasons. It was generally considered to be outside the province of the Church to judge them on economic grounds.

In so far as the function of the Church in the economic order is concerned, the basic principle of the U.L.C.A. has been that the best service of the Church lies in the proclamation of principles applicable to all. Increasingly in the last decade, however, one discovers expressions of the feeling that this is not sufficient. More and more voices are

being heard to the effect that it is also necessary for the Church to train people who are technically competent to deal with these problems and for the Church to learn to apply the principles of the Gospel in specific instances.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter XVII The Economic Order

1. See Hopkins, op. cit., esp. Chapter X, pp. 171 ff.

2. See Lentz, op. cit. and Geisler, op. cit. for evidence of the lack of consideration given to economic problems by the predecessor bodies of the U.L.C.A. in the last half of the 19th century.

3. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1930, p. 494.

4. Loc. cit.

5. Loc. cit.

6. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1932, pp. 196 and 197.

7. Ibid., p. 420.

8. Ibid., p. 418.

9. Minutes, U.L.C,A., 1934, p. 474 (Committee on Reference and Counsel).

10. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1942, pp. 24 and 25.

11. Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1944, p. 424.

12. Minutes, Inner Mission Board, U.L.C.A., May 1, 1919, Vol. I, p. 78.

13. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., May 9, 1940, Vol. I, p. 97.

14. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., December 11, 1941, Vol. I, p. 249.

15. Ibid., p. 250.

16. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C,A., February 8, 1940, Vol. I, pp. 82 and 83 (Meeting of Directors).

17. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., May 9, 1947, Vol. IV, p. 14.

18. Minutes, Board of Social Missions, U.L.C.A., December 12, 1946, Vol. IV, p. 15.

19. This statement is a part of the Minutes, U.L.C.A., 1946, pp. 186-189. It was also published in pamphlet form by the Board of Social Missions. For full statement, see Appendix D.

20. Number 9 under Basic Principles.

21. Number 10 under Duties and Rights.

22. Number 12 under Duties and Rights.

23. Number 4 under Duties and Rights.

24. Minutes, New York and New England Synod, 1926, pp. 75 and 76.

25. Ibid., p. 76. See also Minutes of this Synod, 1927, p. 65.

26. Minutes, Ohio Synod, 1925, p. 119.

27. Minutes, Maryland Synod, 1930, p. 95.

28. Minutes, New York Synod, 1933, p. 144.

29. Minutes, Illinois Synod, 1934, p. 40.

30. Minutes, Illinois Synod, 1931, p. 86.

31. Minutes, New York Synod, 1935, p. 150.

32. Minutes, Pittsburgh Synod, 1937, p. 172.

33. Ibid., p. 173.

34. Loc. cit.

35. Loc. cit.

36. Minutes, Pittsburgh Synod, 1947, p. 178.

37. Ibid., pp. 178 and 179.

38. The Rocky Mountain Synod asked its pastors to acquaint themselves with the program and practices of the Communist Party in order to be able to combat it. Its primary reason was that "the Communist Party openly advocates and seeks to promote the overthrow of the church and all religions." (Minutes, 1940, p. 20.

39. Franklin K. Fretz, The Lutheran, February 9, 1922, IV, 19, p. 4.

40. Editorial, "Unemployment and Basic Industries," The Lutheran, July 5, 1928, X, 40, pp. 14 and 15.

41. Editorial, "Have the Poor Received the Gospel?" The Lutheran, December 25, 1930, XIII, 13, p. 14.

42. Ambrose Hering, "Hungry and No Chance to Earn," The Lutheran, January 28, 1932, XIV, 18, p. 8.

43. Editorial, "Injustice Charged," The Lutheran, August 4, 1932, XIV, 45, p. 12.

44. Editorial, "Sweatshop Horrors," The Lutheran, December 1, 1932, XV, 9, p. 15.

45. Editorial, "The Church and the N.I.R.A.," The Lutheran, August 3, 1933, XV, 44, p. 18.

46. Editorial, "N.R.A. Endorsed...," The Lutheran, October 5, 1933, XVI, 1, p. 24.

47. Editorial, "In Behalf of Fair Competition," The Lutheran, June 6, 1935, XVII, 36, p. 14.

48. Loc. cit.

49. Loc. cit.

50. W.H. Greever, "The Church and Socialization," The Lutheran, January 11, 1934, XVI, 15, pp. 3 and 5.

51. Editorials,"Social Reconstruction" and "Unemployment Insurance," The Lutheran, January 31, 1935, XVII, 18, p. 15.

52. The Lutheran, December 3, 1947, XXX, 10, p. 50.

53. Franklin K. Fretz, "The Newer Consciousness in Industry," The Lutheran, May 8, 1919, I, 2, p. 30.

54. Loc. cit.

55. Editorial, "Labor Announces Its Program," The Lutheran, May 15, 1919, I, 3, p. 55.

56. Editorial, "Breaking Up Labor Unions," The Lutheran, June 23, 1921, III, 39, p. 17.

57. See, for example in The Lutheran: editorial, "The Railroad Problem...," September 4, 1919, I, 19, p. 372; December 2,

1920, III, 10, p. 4; E.C. Cooper, "Obligations of Industry and Labor," April 5, 1934, XVI, 27, p. 9.

58. Editorial, "The Right to Strike," The Lutheran, August 24, 1922, IV, 47, pp. 3 and 4.

59. Editorial, "Is Democracy Safe for the United States?" The Lutheran, November 20, 1919, I, 30, p. 602.

60. Editorial, "The Right to Strike," The Lutheran, August 24, 1922, IV, 47, pp. 3 and 4. Also, editorial, "We Oppose Strikes and Lockouts," January 25, 1923, V, 17, p. 3.

61. Loc. cit. (Editorial, "We Oppose Strikes...").

62. "Let Labor Disown Its Radicals," The Lutheran, January 8, 1920, I, 37, p. 734.

63. Editorial, "Basis of Miners' Wage Increase...," The Lutheran, December 4, 1919, I, 32, p. 636.

64. Editorial, "Railroads to be Turned Back to Their Owners...," The Lutheran, January 8, 1920, I, 37, p. 736.

65. A.D. Mattson, "The Church and the Labor Movement," Social Missions Quarterly, June 15, 1943, IV, 2, p. 4. See also Paul Glatzert, "A Goal for Christian Laymen," Ibid., p. 10.

66. For the program of one such school, see Social Missions Quarterly, December 15, 1948, IX, 4, p. 2.

67. See, for example, Social Missions Quarterly, December 15, 1948, IX, 4.

68. Roy Hashinger, The Lutheran, October 2, 1946, XXIX, 1, p. 17.

69. "Pastor Goes to C.I.O. Convention," The Lutheran, December 11, 1946, XXIX, 11, pp. 15-17.

70. Ibid., p. 17.

71. The Lutheran, January 1, 1947, XXIX, 14, p. 50.

72. Ibid., p. 35.

73. Loc. cit.

74. Oscar Blackwelder, "Congress Opens," The Lutheran, January 1, 1947, XXIX, 14, p. 12.

75. Paul J. Trout, "Can Laboring Men Be Christian?" The Lutheran, March 5, 1947, XXIX, 23, p. 18. See entire article, pp. 18-21.

76. The Lutheran, April 2, 1947, XXIX, 27, p. 35.

77. Editorial, "Will Business Have a New Conscience?" The Lutheran, December 19, 1918, XXIII, 12, p. 10.

78. Franklin K. Fretz, "The Newer Consciousness in Industry," The Lutheran, May 8, 1919, I, 2, p. 30.

79. Editorial, "Industry as Service," The Lutheran, August 21, 1919, I, 17, p. 334. See also editorial, "A Corporation That Avoids Labor Trouble," November 22, 1923, VI, 8, p. 15.

80. Abdel Ross Wentz, "Martin Luther and Modern Business," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, January, 1934, VII, 1, p. 52.

81. C.F. Sanders, "Civilization is Sick...," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1934, VII, 3, p. 304.

82. Charles Venable, "Religion and the Profit Motive," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, April, 1946, XIX, 2, p. 153.

83. Ibid., pp. 153 and 154.

84. Paul Kirsch, "The Church's Strategy for Survival," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1941, XIV, 3, pp. 267 and 268.

85. Howard Gold, "No Quarrel With Profit," The Lutheran, February 12, 1925, VII, 20, p. 6.

86. William H. Stackel, "Service or Profit as Business Motive," The Lutheran, March 14, 1935, XVII, 24, p. 8.

87. Ibid., p. 9. See also Emil Fischer, "The Christian and the Economic Order," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, January, 1938, XI, 1, pp. 29-42.

88. "Fascism," The Lutheran, November 12, 1936, XIX, 7, p. 6. See also October 1, 1936, XIX, 1, p. 15 and November 5, 1936, XIX, 6, p. 4.

89. The Lutheran, May 8, 1919, I, 2, p. 27.

90. Editorial, "Shall Sovietism Be Recognized?" The Lutheran, April 29, 1920, I, 53, p. 1026.

91. "Intense Antagonism to Religion," The Lutheran, March 6, 1930, XII, 23, p. 17.

92. E.P. Pfatteicher, "Luther or Lenin," The Lutheran, November 10, 1932, XV, 6, p. 26.

93. Paul A. Krauss, "Communism and the Christian Student," The Lutheran, April 1, 1937, XIX, 27, p. 6.

94. Oscar Blackwelder and Ralph Loew, "Freedom in Russia," The Lutheran, November 5, 1941, XXIV, 6, p. 8.

95. For other references in The Lutheran to Communism see: May 8, 1918, I, 2, p. 34; January 23, 1919, XXIII, 17, p. 2; August 7, 1919, I, 15, p. 291; December 4, 1919, I, 32, p. 643; February 5, 1920, I, 41, p. 816; December 4, 1930, XIII, 10, p. 12; May 28, 1931, XIII, 35, p. 15; October 19, 1933, XVI, 3, p. 15; December 7, 1933, XVI, 10, 13; February 7, 1935, XVII, 19, p. 14; February 20, 1936, XVIII, 21, pp. 10 and 11; December 24, 1936, XIX, 13, p. 17; February 11, 1937, XIX, 20, p. 13; April 2, 1947, XXIX, 27, p. 34.

96. "Political 'Isms'," The Lutheran, November 5, 1936, XIX, 6, p. 4.

97. Editorial, "Labor and the Railroad Problem," The Lutheran, January 8, 1920, I, 37, p. 736.

98. C.F. Dapp, "Will the Coal Industry Reform?" The Lutheran, December 16, 1920, III, 12, p. 13.

99. "What to Do with Socialists and Anarchists?" The Lutheran, March 4, 1920, I, 45, p. 886.

100. John A.W. Haas, "Economic Theory and Christianity," The Lutheran Church Review, October, 1919, XXXVIII, 4, pp. 387 and 388.

101. E.P. Pfatteicher, "A Meeting of the Socialist Party," The Lutheran, May 24, 1923, V, 34, p. 13.

102. W. Rufus Rings, "Industrial Situation," The Lutheran, October 6, 1932, XV, 1, p. 24.

103. Albert W. Shumaker, "Preaching Alone Insufficient," The Lutheran, November 17, 1932, XV, 7, p. 21.

104. Loc. cit.

105. The Lutheran, December 8, 1932, XV, 10, p. 21.

106. Howard R. Gold, "Industrialism and the Church," The Lutheran, January 9, 1919, XXIII, 15, p. 4.

107. Editorial, "The Lutheran Attitude Toward Industrial Questions," The Lutheran, July 14, 1921, III, 42, p. 16.

108. The Lutheran, September 20, 1923, V, 51, p. 14. See also other editorials, October 21, 1926, IX, 3, p. 15; August 25, 1927, IX, 47, p. 4.

109. The Lutheran, September 12, 1929, XI, 50, pp. 14 and 15. See also November 21, 1929, XII, 8, pp. 3 and 4.

110. F.H. Knubel, The Gospel for an Age of Labor (New York: Pamphlet published by the Inner Mission Board, U.L.C.A., 1919), p. 6.

111. See ibid., pp. 9-12.

112. F.H. Knubel, "Light on Labor," (Sermon included in booklet, Radio Addresses), 1931, no pagination.

113. John A.W. Haas, "Economic Theory and Christianity," The Lutheran Church Review, October, 1919, XXXVIII, 4, p. 390.

114. Emil E. Fischer, "The Christian Ethics of Industrialism," The Lutheran Church Review, April, 1922, XLI, 2, p. 168.

115. Charles Venable, op. cit., pp. 155 and 156.

116. See editorials: "Business and Religion," December 3, 1925, VIII, 10, p. 3; "Social Problems," August 27, 1941, XXIII, 48, p. 18.

117. Paul Heisey and Amos Traver, Studies in Social Problems(Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1938), p. 40.

118. Raymond T. Stamm, "The Economic Factor in the Genesis of Christianity," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, July, 1933, VI, 3, p. 290.

119. Ibid., p. 291.

120. Oscar Blackwelder, "The Columbus Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, January, 1937, X, 1, p. 10.

121. Loc. cit.

122. H.W. Lammond, "The Gospel and Social Ills," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, January, 1940, XIII, 1, p. 49.

123. Oscar Blackwelder and Ralph Loew, "Labor and the Church," The Lutheran, October 6, 1943, XXVI, 1, p. 8.

124. See editorial, "The Church Speaks to Labor," The Lutheran, July 10, 1946, XXVIII, 41, pp. 19 and 21.

125. This is a continuing emphasis. The 1950 Convention of the U.L.C.A. directed the Board of Social Missions to intensify its efforts in this direction. In 1952, however, the Executive Board turned down a request by the Board of Social Missions for an additional staff member to devote full time to the area of economic life.

CHAPTER XVIII

CONCLUSION

From this survey of the social aspects of U.L.C.A. literature, several facts have emerged as to the underlying philosophy of that church body with reference to its social task. We have observed that the U.L.C.A. came from a background in which there was, with few exceptions, an aloofness to the problems of society. Note has also been taken, however, of the fact that U.L.C.A. testimony, even in the early days, was practically unanimous in deploring such aloofness as unworthy of the Church. There is no doubt but that the literature of the Church exhibits a genuine concern for society. At no time did U.L.C.A. resolutions, reports or writers take the position that the Church should cut itself off from the world as something inherently evil, and with which Christians could have no dealings except to condemn and flee.

In spite of the fact that this concern for society needs to be underscored, it is also true that the U.L.C.A., especially in early days but also in some measure in recent years, was willing to have very few <u>direct</u> dealings, as a Church, with the institutions or problems of society.

The method by which the U.L.C.A. gave expression to its feeling of social responsibility was that which we have called the evangelical approach. This method was characterized by two emphases. First, there

was stress on individuals. The grace of God flowed through Word and Sacraments into the lives of individuals not into institutions or agencies. The Church, as the custodian or channel of the Word and Sacraments must, therefore, consider its work as that of dealing with individuals. Second, this approach was characterized by an emphasis upon freedom. Any sort of legalism, or reliance upon coercion, must be eschewed by the Church as being out of harmony with its basic purpose. It was by the voluntary commitment of individuals that the Church was to do its work. This, plus the fact that the source of its message and power was to be found in what God has done in Christ, is the heart of the evangelical approach.

We have mentioned the fact that although certain emphases have changed and new dimensions have been added, this evangelical approach has been, and still is, at the center of U.L.C.A. thinking about its social task.

The basic social task of the Church, therefore, was conceived to be that of converting individuals to Christ by means of a faithful witness to Word and Sacraments. It has been stressed many times within the U.L.C.A., both officially and unofficially, that this is a necessary prelude to any kind of real social reform. As a result, the Church serves society best by remaining true to its primary task and thus, undergirding all other efforts at improving society. To emphasize this approach, we have pointed out that the U.L.C.A. totally rejected the Social Gospel movement on both theological and methodological grounds.

The Inner Mission, which was emphasized greatly by the U.L.C.A., fitted in well with this basic conception of the Church's social task.

It has been indicated that the Inner Mission served both to increase the social concern of the U.L.C.A. and yet to stifle it at a certain point. It gave the U.L.C.A. a channel for its social energies and yet helped to keep this church body apart from many of the social movements of the day by inculcating a feeling that the social duty of the Church was being done.

The essential definition of the Inner Mission is "the merciful works of the Church," or, "the works of serving love." We have seen that these merciful works were given a place in the function of the Church almost equal to the administration of Word and Sacraments. They represented the fruitage of faith and were an inevitable part of the life of the Church.

This emphasis caused a great out-pouring of charity by the U.L.C.A. Since the Church was interested in the whole man, not only his soul, the Church sought to care for the material needs of those unable to care for themselves as a part of its total ministry.

Although there were some statements to the contrary, the entire practical effect of the Inner Mission was in the direction of amelioration. Except as a by-product, there was little attempt to criticize or correct social injustice.

Although the emphasis has always been on the individual, it was also felt that the Gospel of Christ is applicable to social situations. The basic question is, however, who is to make it applicable? The answer of the U.L.C.A. has been that this is outside of the province of the Church but is the <u>duty</u> of church members functioning in a dual capacity as Christian citizens. Out of the power of Christ in their

lives and from the inspiration they receive from the Church, these individuals may form associations, agencies or institutions which will function to solve social problems. As such, they may use methods, eg., legislation, which are closed for the Church.

During the history of the U.L.C.A., there has been a growing conviction that the Church must educate its members with reference to social problems. Since, by its own definition, the only way the U.L.C.A. could influence society was through its individual members, it seemed logical that it would become a duty of the Church to educate its members fairly specifically in the relationship of the Gospel to social problems.

The content, extent and method of this education probably represents the greatest change in the social thinking of the U.L.C.A. during the period that has been studied. Whereas in early days only vague statements were made that Christians should apply their Christianity in daily life, in recent years there has been an ever-increasing volume of education (seminars, institutes, schools, speeches, articles) relating to specific social problems. Moreover, the willingness to take stands on social questions as well as the occasional registering of attitudes of the Church on social matters with legislators are not thought of as attempts to exert authority, but rather as educational devices.

A consideration of these latter techniques brought us to a description of the U.L.C.A. and social action. It has been pointed out that, through the years, there has been a developing social consciousness in the U.L.C.A. This culminated in the calling of a full-time Secretary for Social Action in 1947. The very fact of the establishment of such a position in the official church structure is evidence of a change in

thinking on the part of the Church. Certainly, at the time the U.L.C.A. was formed, such a category of church service would have been inadmissable.

Yet we have also made note of the fact that it is difficult to define exactly the U.L.C.A. conception of social action because the Church, to the present day, is still trying to clarify its own thinking as to its proper role. In general, social action in the U.L.C.A. is basically an educational technique. It must be understood that even social action is based upon an evangelical approach. The task of the Church is still primarily that of dealing with sin in individuals by means of Word and Sacraments. The Church must still depend upon voluntary commitment to achieve its ends.

In spite of this, there is an obvious difference between our description of the social activities of the Church in its early days and those of more recent years. This difference lies not only in the volume of increased education on social matters, but also in the fact that the Church, in its corporate capacity, is much more willing to relate itself to social issues. Herein we discover the social action approach of the U.L.C.A. Without circumventing the basic evangelical idea, the Church has become much more ready to give a corporate witness on social problems. Actually, corporate witness, rather than corporate action, is the heart of social action in the U.L.C.A. This reflects itself in a new readiness to take stands on certain problems and in a continued avoidance of legislative technique. The excessive individualism of early years has been greatly modified.

Thus, while there have been considerable changes in U.L.C.A. social

thinking over the period studied, it is difficult to indicate them clearly and precisely. There are no sharp breaks or significant events which mark one phase of thinking or another. As a result, it has been impossible to divide this study into time periods. On the one hand, even in the early history of the U.L.C.A., occasional statements were made and actions taken (cf. the Committee on Moral and Social Reform) which might with justification be called social action. On the other hand, in recent years, even with the inclusion of social action in the official structure of the Church, the evangelical approach, the idea of the Inner Mission and the emphasis on education have continued unabated. The difference, of course, is largely one of emphasis.

In the background of much of this thinking is the U.L.C.A. attitude toward the possibility of establishing a Christian social order. Although not much writing was done on this, it is quite evident that there was not much enthusiasm for the idea. The conception of sin in Lutheran theology has been too dominating to have the Church go far along the road of utopian thinking. A Christian social order would need as a necessary prelude the conversion of each individual to Christ. Even if that were accomplished, any naive idealism is shattered by the fact that the struggle with sin is still constant (even though the Christian has new resources with which to engage in that struggle).

This does not mean that society is thereby abandoned as hopeless. The Augsburg Confession recognizes a "civil righteousness" by which men can at least order their social lives. Moreover, a society can, either to greater or lesser degree, approximate Christian standards. Here is where the beneficial impact of converted individuals plays a

significant role.

In U.L.C.A. thinking, the Kingdom of God is essentially inward, spiritual and eschatological. Man, by his own efforts, does not set up the Kingdom. God creates the faith that makes new relationships possible. God, in His own time, will create the Kingdom in its fullness.

There are, of course, many reasons, both theological and sociological, for U.L.C.A. attitudes. A few of these have been indicated. Theologically, such doctrines as justification by faith, the difference between Law and Gospel, the two orders or spheres, the conception of sin and the true nature and function of the Church have been of tremendous importance. Yet, the fact that some of these are in the process of being re-interpreted is also significant. Sociologically, the fact of social isolation due to having a rural character, immigration, language barriers and adherence to a European background played some part in forming attitudes and in keeping the Church from having to face many of the problems that were current in society. Although these factors had already begun to break down at the time of the formation of the U.L.C.A., the process was accelerated during the succeeding three decades until, in 1948, it could be said that the U.L.C.A. was completely indigenous to the American scene.

When we turn to the more practical side of the study, which is to discover the stand or attitude of the U.L.C.A. with reference to specific social problems, we find that most of these problems are not dealt with too profoundly, and yet, in a way, it is surprising to discover that some of them are discussed rather extensively.

The U.L.C.A. has no official stand on the relationship of Church and State. Rather, it goes back constantly to traditional Lutheran teaching on the divine creation of two spheres or orders. We have stressed the fact that this idea has been particularly significant for the entire development of the U.L.C.A.'s conception of its social task. Since Church and State were considered as complementary entities in society, the Church was enabled to restrict its function rather narrowly. The attainment of justice (at least in so far as social relationships were concerned) was thought of as the duty of the State. The Church had as its function the preaching of the Gospel. Whether or not this is a true reflection of Lutheran theology is beside the point. The important thing is that this has been the interpretation given within the U.L.C.A. and the practical effects have been widespread.

Church and State are separate, therefore, yet both are under God. The situation in which the State refuses to acknowledge its dependence and responsibility to God, or even to acknowledge God, is the practical one that is causing unrest within the U.L.C.A. with respect to its traditional interpretation.

The U.L.C.A. dealt more extensively with the problem of war than with any other social issue. This is probably due to the fact that its whole history has never really been free either from the prelude to war, war itself, or its aftermath. Actually the traditional Lutheran position as expressed in the Augsburg Confession was adhered to officially by the U.L.C.A. This was that Christians could engage in just wars.

There was, of course, difficulty in defining such an idea and there

was some protest against the idea itself, but, in the final analysis, this position was always upheld. Pacifism never gained much adherence within the U.L.C.A., but individuals who objected to war on the grounds of conscience were given the support of the Church because of the Church's emphasis on the right of individual conscience.

With reference to marriage and divorce, the U.L.C.A. has an officially adopted position. This affirms the dignity and sacredness of marriage, the fact that it is a basic order of creation and that it is a life-long union. Although divorce is deplored, the U.L.C.A. did recognize the possibility of the remarriage of the innocent party where the cause of the divorce was adultery or malicious desertion. Actually, outside of this official statement and the discussion that led up to it, there is little reference to the subject in U.L.C.A. literature. There is, of course, emphasis in study material on the necessity of building Christian marriages and families, but not much else.

The U.L.C.A. never faced in any significant way the problem of race relations. This was, of course, partly because of some of the sociological factors which have already been enumerated. Official Minutes barely touch the problem. Discussion in periodical literature is scant. What there is, however, rejects all ideas of inferiority and superiority and urges that economic and political rights be extended to all without regard to race. On the question of segregation there is division of opinion, but the official Church tends to go in the direction of a break-down of patterns of segregation. At the time of the conclusion of this study, an official statement on race relations

was in preparation.

The U.L.C.A. gave little attention to economic problems until the onset of the Depression of the 1930's. Generally speaking, it was then absorbed in ameliorative activities. Criticisms were offered by many of phases of the capitalistic system, but usually all substitutes were rejected. Reforms were urged within the system rather than the substitution of a new system.

An official statement on labor was adopted in the name of the U.L.C.A. by the Board of Social Missions and the Executive Board of the Church. Although this is in rather general terms, it is a significant document.

As we look to the future, it seems probable that the U.L.C.A. will continue to broaden the base of its theological thinking with reference to its social responsibility. This is a process that has been going on for some time and which will certainly continue until some basic conclusions have been reached. It is probable, however, that the U.L.C.A. will adhere firmly to an evangelical approach in its contact with social problems. Within this basic philosophy, it will probably balance its interest in individuals with a greater emphasis on the corporate witness of the Church. Furthermore, all the evidence points in the direction that the U.L.C.A. will increase its volume of social education and that this will be in ever more specific terms.

In all of this, the U.L.C.A. will simply be seeking new and more effective ways of expressing its concern for society. If its past history gives any indication of its future, however, all of these methods will have to be in harmony with the basic purpose of the Church - the administration of Word and Sacraments.

APPENDICES

These appendices have been included to amplify certain important references given in the text. They are presented in the order in which reference to them appears in the study.

APPENDIX A

PART OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MORAL AND SOCIAL WELFARE TO THE 1932 CONVENTION OF THE U.L.C.A.

The Task as Related to Divine Provision

God has immeasurable concern for human welfare, according to His perfect conception of what welfare is. He has presented His plan and provided the means for its realization. He gives assurance of its adequacy and of its effectiveness. Where His plan has been followed and His means used, there the highest welfare has been experienced. How presumptuous it is in any man to seek any modification of plan or means, by either subtraction or addition, or to question either His wisdom or His honor!

This is what God says is necessary and what He does for moral and social welfare.

1. He says that man must be delivered from sin, - guilt, power, and consequences, - before he even can know what welfare is. Such deliverance He offers through Jesus Christ, His Son, our Saviour.

2. He says that the natural man must be born again. Such regeneration He effects by the Holy Spirit through His Word of Grace, especially in baptism.

3. He says that man must be nurtured, confirmed, and strengthened in the new life so that he is spiritually renovated, transformed, and sanctified, and his whole being brought into harmony with His will. All of this He does for everyone who accepts it, by the Holy Spirit, through His Gospel, especially in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

4. He says that all who accept these gifts of grace become His children to live together in one great brotherhood, each seeking the welfare of every other in loving unselfishness, and all working together with Him to bring His salvation to all mankind. Accordingly He has established His Church for the edification of His children and for the execution of His purposes toward unsaved men. To the Church He has committed His means of grace, and through the Church He has placed upon the individual Christian the responsibility of human agency in the application of His effective means for the realization of the only true moral and social welfare.

The Task as Related to the Church

The Church does not have an open and uncontested field for its endeavor in behalf of moral and social welfare. The Church is only a part of society and the greater part of society is not only unchristianized, fostering the forces of evil, but the various portions of unchristianized society also have their codes and moral standards and programs for betterment. These conflict with those of the Church in regard to needs, aims, means and measures. Then, too, the true Church, composed of those who are truly in harmony with God's will, is not identical with the organized Church in which are many who are no more Christianized than many of those outside the Church. It is no uncommon thing for social workers outside of the Church to enlist the support of our people in programs of but superficial and temporal benefit. This is a challenge for stronger leadership in the Church, for a more positive and clear-cut statement of principles and a more aggressive and effective program.

No matter what the conflicts, or the compromises, or calls for

cooperation from outside of the Church may be, the full responsibility for the promotion of moral and social welfare in any real sense, remains upon the Church.

We proceed to specify the chief things essential to the Church in any effective endeavor for moral and social welfare.

1. The Church must realize clearly what the defects and evils in the present social order are, and from what they come. This we have sought to indicate in the above.

2. The Church must realize clearly what the social order is to be when its task is accomplished. This we attempt to show by pointing out certain essentials that must characterize the ideal order.

(1) An order in which the meaning of life is construed according to the purpose of its divine author: The realization, in the development of perfect personality, of the eternal spiritual values, comprehensively specified as follows:

a. The Good, - whatever pertains to or contributes to the perfection of personality.

b. The True, - the essential, eternal realities in which all values inhere, for the enduement and enrichment of personality.

c. The Beautiful, - perfection itself, to be realized and experienced by personality in purity, unity, harmony and glory, in all relationships.

(2) An order in which the value and potentialities of personality are correctly appraised, duly appreciated and consistently sought.

(3) An order in which justice secures to everyone full measure of opportunity for the realization of the possibilities of his personality.

Justice, in its purpose, is to maintain the rights inherent in the nature, value and potentialities of personality, to the realization of "welfare" in the attainment, acquirement and enjoyment of the substance of those rights within the sphere of liberty; and, in its spirit, justice is to have and manifest the will to promote the welfare of every personality without partiality.

(4) An order in which true religion unifies and harmonizes the life of individuals in a practical brotherhood, through the experience of individual fellowship with the common Father, - God.

(5) An order in which the practical brotherhood expresses itself through loving, unselfish service, by the administration of true Christian stewardship.

The Gospel in the hearts of men regenerates and sanctifies so that such an ideal social order is effected and moral and social welfare is achieved. If it be said that such an order is ideal and is beyond human achievement in this world, the answer is that the Christian can aim at nothing less, cannot even make compromises or excuses, and that all betterment must come from the effort to attain to this idea. This is the only practically effective way to welfare, no matter how far the ideal is above the real.

These specific aims may be placed alongside the catalogued moral evils and social ills and it will be seen that they furnish the specific correction and cure for every evil and ill. When the Gospel is brought effectively to a man's heart, in its purity, power and principles, it brings God into that heart to give it purpose, motive and will in harmony with God's purpose, motive and will.

3. The Church must think and act in consistency with the facts and principles involved in this task.

(1) With reference to human nature.

a. Facts: That human nature, per se, possesses the essential attributes of personality, - intelligence, emotion and will; and, That human nature, since sin entered the world, is in a state of depravity until regenerated.

b. Principle: A power is to be applied to corrupt human nature which will change its state by regeneration and renovation, but without violence to the essential attributes of personality:

(a) Convincing the mind.

(b) Convincing the conscience.

(c) Converting the will.

(d) Consecrating the heart.

(2) With reference to the Gospel.

a. Fact: The Triune God deals directly with the individual man, - redeeming, regenerating, renovating and sanctifying him.

b. Principle: The mystical nature of the divine operation must be recognized, because the inner spiritual transformation is so effected as to institute the Kingdom of God, "which cometh not with observation."

Thus any idea of the real or permanent solution of moral and social problems by law alone, or any other merely human means, is dissipated, and any seeming benefits from such are recognized as no more than temporary alleviations.

4. The Church must strictly and faithfully use the divinely appointed means for the christianization of men, without subtraction or addition, in both content and implication, which means are: The Word and Sacraments.

5. The Church must employ those measures in this work which are divinely commanded and approved, and are consistent with means and needs. These measures are:

(1) Preaching, - the public proclamation of the Gospel and the conduct of Worship.

(2) Administration of the Sacraments, - the individualizing of the means of grace for personal appropriation.

(3) Teaching, - the exposition and interpretation of the Gospel for personal acceptance and application.

(4) Witnessing, - testimony to the experience of the power and blessedness of the Gospel and to assurance of the truth of its factual claims, in confirmation of the faith by which its blessings are received.

(5) Demonstration, or ministration, - the exemplification of the power of the Gospel in such a life of spiritual purity and beauty, and of Christ-like attitudes and loving service as will "adorn the Gospel," and recommend it by its fruits. Verbal testimony requires the life testimony for its confirmation to effectiveness. This is done through ministration, especially the ministration of mercy.

Through these measures of transmission the Gospel enters the hearts of the individual man and permeates society like the leaven in the lump. Thus it effects the only transformations possible for real moral and social welfare.

6. The Church must not be afraid and must not fail to condemn evil. It must follow the example of the Prophets in the Old Testament and of Christ and the Apostles in the New. Sometimes it must censure severely, and sometimes it must denounce acts and courses of conduct. It is here

that the Church makes a right use and application of the law. But it cannot censure except it act in a sense as a censor. If such a thing were possible the Church should serve as a "conscience for the world." Every physician who makes his treatment effective recognizes and points out the nature and power of the disease, for which the treatment is given.

At the Lutheran World Convention in Copenhagen Dr. Knubel said that the Church is called to "a ministry of condemnation" in its relation to society. He said: "In a world of wrong silence in itself would often be sin. Christ and His Church do not, however, condemn as the world condemns. Judgment is not the purpose. The great difference is that they so condemn as to lead to repentance. Such condemnation is born of and guided by love."

7. The Church must recognize its responsibility for the realization of God's will for the temporal and eternal welfare of all mankind, and must work according to His plan.

The execution of His plan, by the use of His means, through His approved measures would so exalt piety, and so invigorate and promote Christian brotherhood, and to develop Christian stewardship that an incorruptible citizenship would control the destinies of the state, wealth would become the servant of all, the conflict between labor and capital would cease, sex immorality with its diseases would disappear, divorce courts would be closed, leisure would be used for the enrichment of personality instead of indulgences in dissipations, the under-privileged would find open doors of opportunity, and this would be like another world. This all depends upon the faithfulness of the Church, which needs only actually to enlist, in active endeavor, everyone it has enrolled

into nominal membership. No new program needs to be set up. No new machinery needs to be added. The great need is spiritual impulse. The responsibility rests ultimately, as primarily, upon the individual man in the church, but for all cooperative endeavor the organization is already complete and sufficient. When we come down to the purely practical aspect of this matter, with our general observations before us, we find the key to solution, if we think of our subject as a problem , or to success if we think of it as an enterprise, in the will to do. If we look at the Church, with the charge of blameworthy degree of failure against it, we know that it is a human failure, and we center our attention upon the leadership of the Church, particularly upon the pastor. If we are not willing to charge him with responsibility for failure in his community, we are ready to credit him with being the key-man to success. If the pastor has clear views upon applied Christianity, through brotherhood and stewardship, if he has full faith in the power of the Gospel to produce brotherhood and induce stewardship, if he has a deep experience of the blessedness of vital religion and practices both brotherhood and stewardship, if he has the zeal of a true disciple of Jesus Christ, - is filled with His love, and preaches, teaches, testifies and lives accordingly, - he will be a social servant who can show definite results, and he will be a missionary who will win and enlist others, - within his church council, in his Sunday school, in his missionary societies, among the men and children groups and in his congregation as a whole, and thus will the community be reached. When a man is identified with God through communion, God communicates love for fellowman to his heart and spiritual impulse is begotten, which is first

compassion, then passion and then personal concern and Christ-like service.

This joint enterprise, between God and man, for the realization of man's supreme interests and for the glory of Almighty God, claims the full measure of human loyalty and endeavor, as it is assured of divine faithfulness and power.

APPENDIX B

THE CHURCH - AND A WORLD AT WAR

A Statement of the Louisville Convention (1942)

of the United Lutheran Church in America

1. The world today is torn with strife which, in its roots, is the product of godlessness. God has been left out of the lives of men. Therefore, mankind is reaping the harvest of its apostasy, in judgment, discipline, and vicarious suffering. All have sinned, against each other, against themselves, and thus against God. Our world has lost its religious moorings. In too many places its mind is perplexed and its motives confused because its soul is dark. In too many places it has lost the light of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our struggle is not alone or primarily against flesh and blood, it is against spiritual wickedness in the high places of man's being. As a first and fundamental step toward righteousness and peace we call all people to repentance and a rededication of their lives to the will of God. In His will alone is man's peace. Men will never get right with each other until they have first gotten right with God.

2. The storms and agonies of war have been brought down upon the nations of the world because they have in practice denied the sovereignty of the God of Brotherhood and Good Will. The worship of self and the consequent lust for power, ruthless of the rights of others, is man's fundamental idolatry. It is a plague, born of the devil, nourished by vaunting pride, with which the Christian Church and Christian people cannot anywhere temporize. Today, after years of guilt in which all

have played their part, it threatens to extinguish from the earth those ideals of freedom and human brotherhood which are the fundamentals of our faith as Christians, and are the spiritual essence of all true national life. Therefore, we call upon our own people in particular, and all Christian people in general, to dedicate themselves wholly, with every resource of heart and mind and conscience, to the defeat and destruction of this evil wherever it exists.

3. Since we believe God reigns, and is working out His purposes, we believe that a better world order can be born out of the present travail. We believe that although He is "afflicted in the afflictions of His people," nevertheless, He is also using the "wrath of men to praise Him" - to draw the nations together into a world family - to show their interdependence - to teach them the necessity for world co-operation. He wants His children to live together in brotherhood. These are the ideals of His Kingdom. We belive that Kingdom shall inevitably come, and that His Glory shall "cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." To that end we summon our people to an earnest, searching study of the ways and means to an enduring world peace - to a study of the implications of this goal with respect to national prerogatives, and economic privileges and religious prejudices - to a study of the pre-requisites, for such a goal, of world-law, world-freedom, world-justice, and an adequate world-authority, implemented with police power to maintain international tranquility. We urge every congregation to make such a study a part of its educational program in the coming year.

4. But a world peace will come only to men of good will. Peace is not an unconditional gift of God. It is a by-product of righteousness.

Righteousness and good will are God's first goals. Peace is their flower and fruit. If enduring peace is to come to mankind it can come only to men and through men who are wholly dedicated, through faith in Christ, and by the power of His Holy Spirit, to righteousness and good will. This faith and power, bearing fruit in righteousness and good will, are the only real bases of a just and lasting peace. Therefore, all Christians are challenged as never before, by the spectacle of a world-agony born of selfishness and hate, to cultivate in their lives the gifts of God's grace, through God's Word and Sacraments, that they may become more effective exemplars and evangelists of that righteousness and good will, which alone can produce a just and lasting peace.

5. The powers of evil generate special spiritual poisons to gain their end. Christians will need to be especially on guard against the passions of hate and revenge, which will inevitably arise to make men bitter, and unforgiving, toward our enemies. To give these passions sway will transform any temporal victory into eternal defeat. We will then indeed win another war - in the long, dark, tragic record of man's inhumanity to man - and will lose the peace. Let all Christians pray for special Grace from God, that hatred in the days ahead may not frustrate His ends for us, and that the bright promise of a brotherly world for all mankind, now being bought at bloody cost, may not be betrayed by the spirit of revenge.

6. The end of the present conflict will find the war-torn peoples of the world in tragic want. The Church must be ready to bring to them a ministry of merciful help and relief in the name of Christ. Our Lutheran Church is already engaged upon such a program of help to the

distressed areas of the world through Lutheran World Action. We call upon our people to a generous support of these relief programs, and to be ready to increase that support, commensurate with the growing needs of suffering peoples, in the days that lie ahead.

7. Great occasions call for great men. The plight of humanity today and the possibilities for the future call for great Christians and a more effective witness by the Church. Therefore, we summon our own people to a new and solemn dedication of themselves and all they have, of loyalty and love and life, for a renewed proclamation of Christ's Gospel, and a world-wide advance by His Church. We believe that God is plowing all the nations for a new Gospel harvest. The Church is confronted by an unparalleled opportunity to mold the new age after the pattern of the Kingdom of God. The time is ripe for a vigorous program of world missions. We can only seize the opportunity, as we give ourselves in sacrificial ardent witness, as we dedicate, more generously than ever before, our earthly goods, all that we are and all that we have, to the cause of Christ's Kingdom and the conquest of the world for Him.

8. Finally, the paramount service the Church has to render to a world at war is to proclaim the Redemptive Love of God, and to make men, indeed, the sons of God by the power of His Holy Spirit. To that end we call upon our people, and all Christians everywhere, to renewed prayer, and the cultivation of spiritual values through the preaching of the Word of God, and the Holy Communion, as the primary means by which we may gain the vision, faith, courage and patience needed to accomplish God's holy purposes for us and for all mankind.

APPENDIX C

A STATEMENT ON HUMAN RELATIONS

Adopted by

The Board of Social Missions and

The Executive Board of

The United Lutheran Church in America

Since one of the disruptive forces which hinders the will of God is prejudice and discrimination in human relations, the United Lutheran Church in America sets forth the following propositions as the basis for study, discussion, experimentation, and concerted action by its congregations and members.

I. Christian Principles

The Word of God, which the Church proclaims, reveals the righteous judgment of God upon sinful man, and sets forth the distinctive power of Christ to redeem him.

1. God the Father is the Creator of all mankind. We are made in His likeness. In the light of the common creation of all men, differences in physical characteristics or social background are only of incidental importance.
2. God condemns all injustice, all hatred, all abuse and persecution of men. His judgment is revealed in the moral sickness of all men and in the torn fabric of our common life.
3. God's atoning grace embraces every man. Through His Son, Jesus Christ, God offers redemption to all. Christ died for all mankind. All men

have equal worth in God's sight.

4. Forgiveness through the Cross restores men to fellowship with God. Through the remission of sins the way is opened to reconciliation between men. The love of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Cross, leads men to the deepest kind of human fellowship and mutual service. By the power of the Cross men can overcome prejudice, discrimination, and exploitation which sinfully distort God's order and are the basic cause of social tension.
5. God calls all men through the Gospel to Christian brotherhood. Love, which flows from God, seeks to create justice and true community. Love for one's fellowmen is the necessary counterpart of love for God. God calls men to serve Him by serving each other.
6. In God's providence Christians, different in racial, geographical, economic, and social backgrounds, may use their differences to contribute to the total enrichment of life. No group is self-sufficient. By the exercise of justice and brotherhood men may cooperate in building true human community.
7. The abiding love of Christ, our Lord, impels us. We dare not separate ourselves from that love. Christ is the one Word of God, to whom we must listen and whom we must trust and obey in life and death. Thus Christians must face all human relationships in the spirit and power of Christ's love.

II. Human Rights and Responsibilities

In the light of these truths of Christian Faith the Church ought to help its people by offering a common witness to guide the individual conscience. Consistent Christian living requires that men shall seek to

accord to each other the observance of the following rights and their matching responsibilities:

1. To possess and to respect the life and dignity of the human person as a child of God for whom Christ died.
2. To worship God without human distinctions in the Church, the Body of Christ.
3. To develop his God-given talents through education and cultural pursuits in order to use these talents in answer to God's call.
4. To establish a home in living space and housing conducive to a wholesome family life.
5. To occupy the place in economic life for which he is individually fitted, being free to advance therein on the basis of character and ability.
6. To share the privileges and obligations of community life, having equal access to all public services, including those related to health, education, recreation, social welfare, and transportation, and receiving equal consideration from persons and institutions serving the public.
7. To exercise one's citizenship in elections and all the other processes of government, having freedom for inquiry, discussion and peaceful assembly, and receiving police protection and equal consideration and justice in the courts.

III. Propostions for Christian Action

The foregoing declaration of Christian principles in the field of human relations and the enunciation of human rights and their attendant responsibilities derived therefrom, inevitably point toward Christian

action. In working out the implications of our faith we face an awesome and urgent task in overcoming the evil tensions and injustices in human relations that obedience to God requires us to challenge. Christians ought to lay the following propositions to heart:

1. Acknowledge Our Sin

Evil tensions and injustices resulting from racial and cultural practices must be faced before God. The unacknowledged sins of pride, fear, injustice and hatred have added a great moral peril to our present situation. Men must learn in repentance to seek God's atoning grace and renewing Spirit so that society may attain its true basis in God's order.

2. Accept Individual Responsibility

Each Christian must realize his moral responsibility to God for his actions affecting his neighbor. Each must examine his actions in the light of God's commands. Each must learn to show respect to all men as children of God and render justice to those with whom he deals. This obligation is crucial today in relation to members of minority groups.

3. Begin in the Home

Our families must nurture their members in Christian life and outlook so that people of different backgrounds are respected and treated with equal fairness and good will. Parents must be on guard neither to pass on to their children the sins of prejudice, nor to lead them in discrimination which is unbecoming to Christians. Rather it is the duty of parents to lead their children, by precept and example, in interracial cooperation and understanding.

4. Continue at Work

All of us have special responsibilities in our daily work and

economic activities to strive for justice for our neighbor, fair employment opportunities for all, and the removal of those economic handicaps from which minorities suffer. Christians in labor unions, business organizations, and industrial enterprises should take the lead in working for justice for oppressed groups. Minorities likewise should seek to fulfill in their employment their responsibilities to their employers and fellow-workers, and to the groups affected by their work.

5. Rally as Citizens

Christians have special responsibilities as citizens to make society's laws and practices conform to God's order. Many human rights in which Christians believe, especially rights as to personal safety, citizenship, education, employment, and housing, are not being extended to all men. Christian brotherhood is impeded by practices enforcing segregation. God calls for, and human justice requires, speedy changes at every level and in every area of our society.

Community self surveys, to determine the areas where basic rights are being denied and what the opportunities for remedial action are, have proved useful. Fair Employment Practices Laws have proved generally beneficial in cities and states where they have been enacted. Citizens' groups have secured fair use of educational funds, just action in the courts, and fairer treatment in press and radio for minorities. Christians should work for such constructive changes, and for public support of democratically enacted laws which conform to Christian standards.

6. Arouse the Church

Since the Church is the Body of Christ, it must free itself from those cultural patterns of prejudice and discrimination which persist

in our society and must manifest in its own life the principles and attitudes of Jesus. The Church must seek to be true to its own nature as a community of children of God inclusive of every race, nation, and class who confess Christ as Lord.

The Church's agencies and institutions should seek to serve all people fairly without distinction because of racial or cultural background. All its congregations should be centers of action to develop Christian fellowship across human barriers, and to instill the spirit of equality and Christian brotherhood. To this end the United Lutheran Church in America calls its pastors and people to earnest study and remedial action.

APPENDIX D

THE CHURCH SPEAKS ON LABOR

Adopted by

The Board of Social Missions and

The Executive Board of

The United Lutheran Church in America

Foreword

Few social issues touch the lives of more citizens than Labor-Management relations. On few issues could the Church speak more timely, and it does so under authority of an action by the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of The United Lutheran Church in America, October 17, 1944.

"That the Board of Social Missions together with the Executive Board be requested to formulate a statement on Labor and the Church."

The Church Speaks on Labor

The Church, as it proclaims Christian principles, provides the only complete and perfect solution for human problems. Serious tensions are arising today in the field of labor relationships. Here also Christian principles provide the solution. The United Lutheran Church in America presents these principles, commending their consideration to all who work and particularly to labor leaders, industrialists and all those directly responsible for the well-being, prosperity and peace of our nation.

I. Basic Principles

1. God's moral order recognizes no class system. In his sight all men are of eternal worth. He is no respecter of persons. "There is

neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Galatians 3:28).

2. In God's sight every calling, however high or humble, which contributes to human welfare, is sacred and has His blessing. "Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant" (Matthew 20:27).

3. God ordained work for all. "If any would not work, neither should he eat" (II Thessalonians 3:10). Sloth is a sin against God and man. Every able-bodied person should be engaged in some useful work and society should be so constituted as to make this possible.

4. God has abundantly provided the resources of the earth primarily for human benefit. Possessions are a sacred trust to be used not for selfish materialistic ends, but for human betterment today and in the future generations.

5. God expects all labor to be amply rewarded. This means an honest day's work for an honest day's pay and an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. "The labourer is worthy of his reward" (I Timothy 5:18).

6. Our daily bread is the gift of God. Since all our earning capacity comes from Him, man lives primarily not by what he earns but by what God gives. So we pray, "Give us this day our daily bread." What God gives should be received with thanksgiving.

7. God gives more than daily bread. Out of His love and mercy He has provided in Christ forgiveness of sin. He desires for everyone fullness of life. "I am come that they might have life and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10:10).

8. God expects all to share the burdens of daily life. "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ" (Galatians 6:2).

He requires the strong, the privileged and the able to help the less privileged and the weak. "Unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required" (Luke 12:48).

9. The ultimate solution of all human conflict is not in the realm of law but in the spiritual sphere of love. There is no law perfect enough, nor human judgment wise enough in itself to solve the conflicts which arise in the selfish struggle for possessions. Not legalism but the grace of God, not contracts ultimately, but Christ's spirit of brotherhood and service in the hearts of men are the true source of blessed relationships in all human affairs.

II. Duties and Rights

As a corollary to the above Christian principles, the Church stresses certain fundamental duties which apply both to "management" and "labor". It believes and teaches that men need first of all today to discharge their duties, to themselves, their fellow-men and their God; of they have much, then to use their possessions as stewards of the gifts of God for which they will be held proportionately accountable, - If they have less, then also to use what they have as stewards of the gifts of that God who expects the man of one talent also to regard that talent as a sacred trust.

1. It is the duty of all men to work. It is the duty of all Christian men so to organize their relationships that everyond may have an opportunity for gainful employment.

2. It is the duty of every man, and every man in a Christian social order should have the opportunity, to choose his work in keeping with the abilities which God has given him.

3. It is the duty of every man to provide an adequate living for himself and his dependents. It is the duty of Christian men so to order their economic relationships that, in a world where God has provided "enough and to spare" for all, every man who is worthy and willing to work may obtain an adequate living for himself and his dependents.

4. It is the right of every man to receive a wage commensurate with his abilities and, wherever feasible, in cooperation with his coworkers, to share in the direction and management of his labors.

5. It is the duty of every man to acquire and preserve the fruits of his industry against present and future needs. The social order should be so organized as to secure and protect every man in the rightful possession and enjoyment of the fruits of his industry.

6. It is the duty of every man to develop to the maximum, through education and training, the abilities with which God has endowed him. It should be the goal of a Christian social order to provide maximum opportunities for the education and training of all its members.

7. It is the duty of every man to provide the most favorable conditions for a happy home and family life.

8. It is the duty and right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. The social order should guarantee to every man complete freedom of worship.

9. It is the duty of every man to cooperate in the establishment and maintenance of government so that maximum civil liberties may be enjoyed by all with equal protection for all under the law without discrimination as to race, color or creed.

10. It is the right of every man freely to set up and to maintain, in cooperation with his fellow-men, such forms of health and accident insurance, provision for medical care, unemployment relief and insurance, and old age pensions as will provide security against the hazards of life.

11. It is the right of every man to organize with his fellow workers for collective bargaining through representatives of his own free choice.

12. It is the duty of both management and labor to accept and support conciliation and arbitration in industrial disputes.

III. What the Church Must Do

To insure the performance of these duties and rights in human society the Church in a practical way should:

1. Proclaim God as the owner, man as the steward of the earth's resources, which are not to be exploited for selfish ends.

2. Champion the just cause of every man, regardless of his social status.

3. Uphold the dignity of labor, whether of heart or hand.

4. Advocate that service to society be regarded as the standard of social worth.

5. Proclaim always that the only cure for human selfishness and greed which are the common sources of industrial controversy is the Christian spirit of sacrifice for the greater good, growing out of love for God who desires men to live in a spirit of unselfish brotherhood.

6. Insist that democracy in industry is the only foundation for economic well being.

7. Set a good example in its own affairs, such as investments, use of labor, and remuneration for services, lest it prove subversive of the principles it proclaims.

8. Seek to develop in the Church and community mutual understanding and good will between various groups.

9. Protest the use of force, violence and sabotage by either labor or management in industrial disputes.

10. Be ready and willing to arrange for conferences of management , labor and the public to consider principles of right conduct in human relationships, should the occasion arise.

11. Encourage the promotion of community clinics, and such other co-operative enterprises as are conducive to human betterment, and economic surveys.

12. Encourage the strong to share the burdens of the weak.

13. Talk more about Duties and less about Rights. One of the spiritual weaknesses of our time, from which many of our social problems progressively multiply, comes from the debilitating notion in the minds of people, which has gained almost sanctity, that they can rest back upon things called "Rights." If men understand and do their Duty, Rights will follow, and problems will be solved.

14. Confront all men with the message of Jesus Christ, which alone satisfies the deeper human needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The sources used for this research were mainly primary sources and are largely confined to official church records and the periodical literature of the U.L.C.A. All church records used were primary material; articles and editorials in periodicals which existed within the U.L.C.A. have also been included in that category.

Books have been, for the most part, a secondary source although those written by influential U.L.C.A. authors, and which had an official or semi-official status, have been designated as primary material. Admittedly, classification of some of these books had to be done in an arbitrary manner. Although most of the other books did not enter directly into this study, a brief selected list of those which have been in the background of the research has been appended.

It is understood, of course, that designation as a primary source means that publication was within the time period of our study. Classification of sources has generally been made in order of importance to the study. Within each group, references have been listed alphabetically.

In order to indicate clearly those sources which have been used directly in the dissertation, such works have been marked with an asterisk (*).

A. OFFICIAL CHURCH RECORDS

1. The United Lutheran Church in America

(All U.L.C.A. Minutes published in Philadelphia by the United Lutheran Publication House.)

*Minutes of the First Convention of the U.L.C.A., New York, N.Y., November 14-18, 1918. 117 pp.

Minutes of the Second Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Washington, D.C., October 19-27, 1920. 584 pp.

Minutes of the Third Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Buffalo, N.Y., October 17-25, 1922. 580 pp.

*Minutes of the Fourth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Chicago, Illinois, October 21-29, 1924. 592 pp.

*Minutes of the Fifth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Richmond, Virginia, October 19-27, 1926. 694 pp.

*Minutes of the Sixth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Erie, Pennsylvania. October 9-16, 1928. 646 pp.

*Minutes of the Seventh Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Milwaukee, Wisconsin, October 7-14, 1930. 630 pp.

*Minutes of the Eighth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 12-19, 1932. 579 pp.

*Minutes of the Ninth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Savannah, Georgia, October 17-24, 1934. 588 pp.

*Minutes of the Tenth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Columbus, Ohio, October 14-21, 1936. 520 pp.

*Minutes of the Eleventh Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Baltimore, Maryland, October 5-12, 1938. 596 pp.

*Minutes of the Twelfth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Omaha, Nebraska, October 9-16, 1940. 655 pp.

*Minutes of the Thirteenth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Louisville, Kentucky, October 14-21, 1942. 653 pp.

*Minutes of the Fourteenth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 11-17, 1944. 487 pp.

*Minutes of the Fifteenth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Cleveland, Ohio, October 5-12, 1946. 735 pp.

*Minutes of the Sixteenth Biennial Convention of the U.L.C.A., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 6-14, 1948. 814 pp.

2. Official Boards of the United Lutheran Church in America

(A complete file of the Minutes of the Inner Mission Board and the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A. can be found in the office of the Board of Social Missions, 231 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.).

Minutes of the Inner Mission Board of the U.L.C.A., 1919-1937.

*Second Meeting, May 1, 1919, Vol. I.
*Seventh Executive Committee Meeting, October 2, 1919, Vol.I.
*Fourth Meeting, May 6, 1920, Vol. I.
*Sixth Meeting, May 5, 1921, Vol. II.
*Forty-eighth Executive Committee Meeting, October 1, 1925, Vol. III.

Minutes of the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., 1938-1948.

*Sixth Meeting of the Board of Directors, February 8, 1940, Vol. I.
*Fourth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, May 9, 1940, Vol. I.
*Seventh Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, December 11, 1941, Vol. I.
*Tenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, May 13, 1943, Vol. II.
*Eleventh Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, December 9, 1943, Vol. II.
*Twelfth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, May 11, 1944, Vol. III.
*Thirteenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, December 14, 1944, Vol. III.
*Fifteenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, December 13, 1945, Vol. III.
*Sixteenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, May 9, 1946, Vol. III.
*Seventeenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, December 12, 1946, Vol. IV.
*Eighteenth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, May 9, 1947, Vol. IV.
*Twentieth Meeting of the Board of Social Missions, April 29, 1948, Vol. IV.

3. Constituent Synods of the United Lutheran Church in America

(All of the Minutes of the following Synods were scanned).

Alleghany Synod, 1919-1938.
*1919, *1932, *1933.

California Synod, 1919-1948.
*1921, *1946, *1948.

Canada Synod, 1925-1948.

Central Canada Synod, 1919-1925.

Central Pennsylvania Synod, 1938-1948.
*1920, *1921, *1940, *1941, *1944, *1945.

East Pennsylvania Synod, 1919-1938.
*1920, *1921, *1922, *1923, *1924, *1925, *1927, *1928,
*1930, *1932, *1934, *1938.

Florida Synod, 1929-1950.

Georgia Synod, 1919-1929.

Georgia-Alabama Synod, 1930-1948.

Holston Synod, 1919-1921.

Illinois Synod, 1920-1948.
*1930, *1931, *1932, *1934, *1935, *1939, *1941.

Indiana Synod, 1920-1948.
*1921, *1935.

Iowa Synod, 1919-1948.

Kansas Synod, 1918-1948. (No meeting 1927).
*1918, *1943.

Kentucky-Tennessee Synod, 1934-1948.
*1936.

Maryland Synod, 1919-1948.
*1923, *1927, *1928, *1933, *1934, *1944.

Miami (Ohio) Synod, 1919-1920.

Michigan Synod, 1920-1948.
*1935, *1937, *1940, *1941, *1944.

Mid-West Synod, 1937-1948.

Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1919-1948.
*1924, *1928, *1933, *1937, *1946.

Mississippi Synod, 1919-1948.
*1944.

Nebraska Synod, 1920-1948.

German Nebraska Synod, 1926-27, 29-30, 32-36.

New York Ministerium, 1919-1929.

New York and New England Synod, 1919-1929.
*1924, *1926, *1927.

New York Synod, 1929-1948.
*1921, *1922, *1923, *1924, *1926, *1928, *1932, *1933, *1935, *1946, *1948.

North Carolina Synod, 1919-1948.
*1923.

Northwest Synod, 1919-1948.

Nova Scotia Synod, 1919-1948.
*1940, *1941.

Ohio Synod, 1920-1948.
*1921, *1923, *1924, *1925, *1926, *1927, *1928, *1930, *1933, *1935, *1948.

Pacific Synod, 1919-1948.
*1947, *1948.

Pittsburgh Synod, 1919-1948.
*1928, *1930, *1935, *1936, *1937, *1938, *1939, *1940, *1941, *1947.

Rocky Mountain Synod, 1919-1948.
*1936, *1940, *1946.

South Carolina Synod, 1919-1948. (No meeting 1925).
*1922, *1941, *1945, *1946, *1948.

Susquehanna Synod of Central Pennsylvania, 1924-1931.
*1927, *1931.

Susquehanna Synod, 1932-1938.
*1932, *1933, *1936, *1937.

Tennessee Synod, 1919-1920.

Texas Synod, 1921-1948.

Virginia Synod, 1922-1948.
*1926, *1927.

Wartburg Synod, 1926-1948.
*1943.

West Pennsylvania Synod, 1919-1938.
*1930, *1935, *1936, *1937.

West Virginia Synod, 1919-1948.
*1919, *1927, *1932, *1933, *1934, *1940, *1941, *1943, *1944, *1946, *1947, *1948.

4. Official Year Books

(Published in Philadelphia by the United Lutheran Publication House)

The Lutheran Church Year Book, 1919-1923.
*1919, *1920, *1923.

Year Book of the United Lutheran Church in America, 1923-1948.
*1920, *1929, *1937, *1938, *1939, *1949.

B. PERIODICAL LITERATURE

1. Primary Sources

General Listing

The Lutheran (Philadelphia), 1919-1948.
Official organ of the United Lutheran Church in America. Published weekly. The Lutheran was the result of a merger of Lutheran Church Work and Observer, The Lutheran and the Lutheran Church Visitor. Vol. I, 1 is dated May 1, 1919.

The Lutheran Church Quarterly, (Gettysburg, Pa.), 1928-1947.
This is a quarterly publication of the Lutheran Theological Seminaries at Gettysburg and at Philadelphia. It came about as the result of a merger (recommended by the 1926 Convention of the U.L.C.A.) of The Lutheran Quarterly and The Lutheran Church Review. Although it was not considered an official organ, either of the U.L.C.A. or of the Seminaries, it has served as the major theological journal within the U.L.C.A. Vol. I, 1 is dated January, 1928.

The Lutheran Church Review, (Mt. Airy, Philadelphia), 1919-1927.
The quarterly theological journal of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia. Volume I is dated 1882. The issue for January, 1919 is in Vol. XXXVIII.

The Lutheran Quarterly, (Gettysburg, Pa.), 1919-1927.
The quarterly theological journal of the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. Vol. I is dated 1871. The issue for January, 1919 is in Vol. XLIX.

Inner Mission Work (New York), 1933-1938.
Official quarterly publication of the Inner Mission Board of the U.L.C.A. Generally mimeographed. Vol. I, 1 is dated September 15, 1933.

Social Missions Quarterly (New York), 1939-1948.
Official quarterly publication of the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A. Generally mimeographed. Vol. I, 1 is dated March 15, 1939.

Lutheran Woman's Work (Philadelphia), 1919-1948.
Monthly publication of the Women's Missionary Society, the official women's auxiliary of the U.L.C.A. Vol. I is dated 1908. The issue for January, 1919 is in Vol. XII.

Lutheran Men (Bethlehem, Pa.), 1919-1948.
Monthly publication of the Brotherhood, the official men's auxiliary of the U.L.C.A. Vol. I, 1 is dated January, 1919.

The Luther League Review (Philadelphia), 1919-1948.
Monthly publication of the Luther League of America, the official youth auxiliary of the U.L.C.A. Vol. I dated 1887. The issue for January, 1919 is in Vol. XXXII.

N.B. The magazines of the official auxiliaries also contain topic material. All the issues of these three magazines were scanned, but little material was used directly since most of it is simply the presentation of ideas that had been originated and developed elsewhere.

The Lutheran

Articles and Signed Editorials

Aberly, John, "A Criticism of the U.L.C. Committee's Proposals on War," VI (August 14, 1924), p. 21.

*Aman, John A., "Government, Industry and Religion," XIX (July 7, 1937), pp. 8 and 9.

*Asher, L.I., et. al., "Is Cornelsen a Propagandist?" (Letters to the Editor), XXIX (January 1, 1947), p. 35.

*Blackwelder, Oscar F., "Advertising Alcholic Beverages," XXIX (February 12, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "The Church and Politics," XXIX (June 4, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Church and State," XXX (November 5, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Compulsory Military Training," XXIX (February 19, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Congress Opens," XXIX (January 1, 1947), p. 12.

_____, "Conscription," XXVII (December 27, 1944), p. 12.

*_____, "F.E.P.C.," XXVIII (February 20, 1946), p. 11.

_____, "F.E.P.C.," XXVIII (March 6, 1946), p. 12.

*_____, "Freedom of the Press," XXVIII (October 10, 1945), p. 14.

*_____, "Liquor Ads," XXVIII (October 24, 1945), p. 13.

_____, "Luther's Political Theories," XVIII (October 24, 1935), p. 22.

*_____, "Mixing Religion and Politics," XXIX (April 16, 1947), p. 12.

*_____, "Now Is the Time", XXIX (November 27, 1946), p. 11.

*_____, "Segregation in Churches," XXIX (October 9, 1946), p. 10.

*_____, "Uniform and Divorce Laws," XXIX (February 5, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Universal Military Training," XXIX (April 2, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Universal Military Training," XXIX (June 18, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "The War Question Again," XVII (November 1, 1934), p. 23.

*_____, "Freedom in Russia," XXIV (November 5, 1941), p. 8.

*Blackwelder, Oscar F. and Loew, Ralph, "Labor and the Church," XXVI (October 6, 1943), p. 8.

*_____, "Liquor," XXV (December 16, 1942), p. 7.

*Bolick, Wynne C., "Race Problem in the South," XXX (September 29, 1948), pp. 13-17.

*Brown, B.S., "Co-operation to Christianize Colored Citizens," I (January 8, 1920), p. 738.

*Cooper, E.C., "Obligations of Industry and Labor," XVI (April 5, 1934), pp. 9 and 10.

*Cornelsen, Rufus, "Pastor Goes to C.I.O. Convention," XXIX (December 11, 1946), pp. 15-17.

*Dapp, C.F., "Disarmament or Bankruptcy --- Which?" III (February 3, 1921), p. 5.

_____, "The Miner's Vacation," III (October 14, 1920) pp. 4 and 5.

*_____, "The Pope to Enter American Politics?" III (May 5, 1921), pp. 6 and 7.

*_____, "The Reds and the Near-Reds," I (February 5, 1920), pp. 816 and 826.

*_____, "Will the Coal Industry Reform?" III (December 16, 1920), p. 13.

*De Graff, Marianne, "No Color Line," XXVIII (May 15, 1946), pp. 21-25.

*Dierolf, Claude, "The Distinctive Mission of the Lutheran Church in America," II (August 12, 1920), p. 245.

*Distler, Carl M., "For Three-Fold Service," XXII (November 8, 1939), pp. 6 and 7.

*Dorn, George, "Holy Writ Bearing on Marriage and Divorce," XI (August 22, 1929), pp. 8, 9 and 11.

*_____, "Some Aspects of our Divorce Problem," VI (August 21, 1924), pp. 5 and 6.

*Drach, George, "The Bible's Teaching About Race Relations," X (December 29, 1927), pp. 6 and 7.

Fischer, Emil, "Discussion of Uniform, Interstate Divorce Law," IV (March 16, 1922), pp. 7 and 13.

*_____, "Marriage and the Family in the United States," XI (May 30, 1929), p. 8.

*Flack, E.E., "What Pastors Think," XXII (October 18, 1939), pp. 4 and 5, and seq. pp. 6 and 7.

*_____, "Race Culture Narrowing," XX (October 13, 1937), p. 11.

*Fretz, Franklin K., "The Newer Consciousness in Industry," I (May 8, 1919), p. 30.

*_____, "The Congregation's Nearby Task," IV (February 9, 1922), p. 4.

*Gold, Howard R., "Industrialism and the Church," XXIII (old series,) (January 9, 1919) p. 4.

*_____, "Teaming Industry's Motives to Please God," VII (February 12, 1925,) pp. 6 and 7.

*Greever, Walton H., "The Church and Socialization," XVI (January 11, 1934), pp. 3-5.

*Haas, John A.W., "Christian Ideals for the Common Life," XVI (March 15, 1934), pp. 10 and 11.

*_____, "Some European Impressions," XI (August 22, 1929), p. 15.

*_____, "A World Menace," XVIII (February 20, 1936), pp. 10 and 11.

*Hashinger, W. Roy, "Are Labor Unions Justified?" XXIX (October 2, 1946), pp. 15-17.

Henninger, James F., "Politicians Can be Christians," XXX (November 5, 1947), pp. 19 and 20.

Hering, Ambrose, "Hungry and No Chance to Earn," XIV (January 28, 1932), pp. 8 and 9.

*Herman, Charles T., et.al., "More About Trout," (Open Letters) XXIX (April 2, 1947), p. 35.

*Hoover, Harvey, "Bolshevism in Religion," XXIII (old series), (December 19, 1918), pp. 7 and 8.

*J.F.K., "On Divorce," (Open Letters), XI (October 4, 1928), p. 19.

*Kirsch, Paul J., "An Important Interpretation," (Rejoinder), XXII, (September 18, 1940), pp. 22 and 23.

*Klotsche, E.H., "Relation of Church and State in Catholic, Calvinistic and Lutheran Teaching," XI (August 29, 1929), pp. 8-10.

*Knubel, F.H., "Christian Realism as to War," XXIII (March 5, 1941), p. 6.

*_____, "President Knubel Speaks for the Church on Federal Council's 'Release'," (On Birth Control), XIII (April 2, 1931), p. 15.

*Koch, C. Franklin, "Our Christian Social Conscience," XXIV (October 1, 1941), pp. 6 and 7.

Kramer, John, "On the Separation of Church and State," III (October 14, 1920), p. 17.

*Krauss, Paul H., "Communism and the Christian Student," XIX (April 1, 1937), pp. 6 and 21.

*_____, "An Important Interpretation," XXII (August 28, 1940), pp. 10 and 11.

*Kruger, F.K., "The Modern Family and the Divorce Problem," VI (June 26, 1924), pp. 5, 6, and 15.

*Kunkle, Howard R., "A Lutheran Pacifist," XIX (January 28, 1937), pp. 8 and 9.

*Kunzmann, J.C., "The Christianity of America Dares Not Fail," VIII (January 7, 1926), pp. 4 and 9.

*Little, C.H., "Church and State," XXII (October 25, 1939), p. 8.

*Long, Ralph H., "Cleansing Corrupt Cities," XIII (April 16, 1931), pp. 4 and 5.

*Manken, Henry, "A Recent Episode in Church and State," XI (July 11, 1929), pp. 14 and 15.

*Melhorn, Nathan R., "Again the Liquor Business," XXVIII (April 3, 1946), p. 34.

*_____, "God's Purpose for the World," VIII (October 22, 1925), pp. 5 and 15.

*_____, "Fascism," XIX (November 12, 1936), p. 6.

*_____, "Something About Bolshevism and the Soviet," I (May 8, 1919), p. 27.

*_____, "U.L.C.A. and Communism," XXIX (April 2, 1947), p. 34.

*_____, "When Is A War Just?" XXI (March 8, 1939), pp. 10 and 11.

*Monroe, H.E., "A Colored Pastor's Views," VI (April 10, 1924), p. 24.

*_____, "The Anti-Saloon League," VI (February 14, 1924), p. 24.

*Morentz, Paul I., "In A 'Race-Conscious'Age," XIX (September 1, 1937), pp. 6 and 7.

*Ohl, J.F., "The Principles of Inner Mission," XXIII (January 16, 1919), p. 6.

Peery, R.B., "The Dignity of Labor," XI (August 29, 1929), p. 5.

*Pfatteicher, E.P., "Luther or Lenin," XV (November 10, 1932), pp. 12, 13, 25 and 26.

*_____, "A Meeting of the Socialist Party," V (May 24, 1923), p. 13.

*Reinartz, F. Eppling, "When Is A War Just?" XXI (March 22, 1939), pp. 8 and 11.

*Reisch, Harold W., "Lutherans and Liquor," XXIX (June 11, 1947), pp. 23-25.

*Rings, W. Rufus, "Industrial Situation," XV (October 6, 1932), p. 24.

*Ruff, Elson, "The Year in the Churches," XXVI (October 27, 1943), pp. 9 and 15.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXIX (December 11, 1946), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXIX (January 2, 1947), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXIX (April 16, 1947), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXIX (June 11, 1947), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXX (December 3, 1947), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXX (December 17, 1947), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXX (May 26, 1948), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXX (July 28, 1948), p. 50.

*_____, (In Conclusion) XXX (September 29, 1948), p. 50.

*_____, (The Church in the News), XXVII (May 16, 1945), p. 4.

*Runyon, I. Searles, "Companionship and the Marriage Covenant," IX (August 18, 1927), pp. 9 and 12.

*Schmidt, John, "A Christian Social Order," XVIII (April 30, 1936), pp. 3, 4, and seq. pp. 11 and 19.

*Seebach, Julius F., "Drafting," (In the World's Eye), XXVII (December 20, 1944), pp. 6 and 7.

*_____, "Racism," (In the World's Eye), XXVI (February 23, 1944), p. 5.

*Shumaker, Albert W., "Preaching Alone Insufficient," (Open Letters), XV (November 17, 1932), p. 21.

Springer, August, "Is Unemployment A Sin?" VIII (November 26, 1925), pp. 12 and 13.

*Stackel, William H., "Service or Profit as Business Motive," XVII (March 14, 1935), pp. 8 and 9.

*Stamm, Raymond T., "Religion in Politics," XXX (June 23, 1948), pp. 19-22.

*Sutcliffe, Richard, "Christians in Politics," XXIX (October 9, 1946), pp. 24 and 25.

Swoyer, Grover E., "Duty and Right," XIX (August 11, 1937), pp. 10 and 11.

*Tappert, C.R., "The Christian and His Service in War," XIX (February 18, 1937), pp. 5, 6, and seq. p. 11.

*_____, "Church Affiliations and the Presidency of the United States," X (September 20, 1928), pp. 7 and 22.

*Traver, Amos J., "The Church and Politics," XVII (June 27, 1935), p. 21.

*Trout, Paul J., "Can Laboring Men be Christian?" XXIX (March 5, 1947), pp. 18-21.

*_____. "Toward an Understanding of Labor," XXIX (February 26, 1947), pp. 16-19.

*Van Deusen, Robert E., "International Bill of Rights," XXIX (August 20, 1947), p. 11.

*_____, "Selective Service Act of 1948," XXX (July 14, 1948), p. 11.

*_____, "Washington Social Survey," XXIX (March 19, 1947), p. 12.

*Weiskotten Herbert T. and Kantonen, T.A., "The Status of War in Christian Morality," XXIV (December 17, 1941), pp. 10 and 11. Series of five articles beginning XXIV (November 19, 1941).

Wentz, Abdel Ross, "The Church and Our Times," XVIII (July 23, 1936), pp. 8 and 9.

Zundel, W.A., "The Lutheran Church and Democracy," XXIII (old series), (November 28, 1918), pp. 6, 7 and 9.

Unsigned Editorials

*"Abandon Neutrality," XXII (June 19, 1940), p. 4.

"Anarchists Hate Religion," I (November 20, 1919), p. 614.

*"Another War," XVI (January 25, 1934), pp. 16 and 17.

*"As to Social Programs," VIII (April 8, 1926), p. 13.

*"Baptists on the Divorce Question," II (July 15, 1920), p. 184.

*"Basis of Miner's Wage Increase to be Cost of Living and Regular Employment," I (December 4, 1919), p. 636.

*"The Black Plague," I (July 11, 1919), p. 210.

"Bolshevism," I (May 15, 1919), p. 54.

*"Breaking Up Labor Unions," III (June 23, 1921), p. 17.

*"Business and Religion," VIII (December 3, 1925), p. 3.

*"The Christian Citizen," XIII (October 16, 1930), pp. 4 and 15.

*"Christian Citizens," XVII (January 10, 1935), p. 14.

*"The Christian Politician," XIII (April 30, 1931), p. 12.

" The Church and Disarmament," III (June 2, 1921), p. 17.

"Church and Industry," III (September 15, 1921), p. 13.

*"Dr. Knubel on the Prohibition Law," VIII (March 4, 1926), p. 3.

"The Church and its Duties," XVII (January 17, 1935), p. 14.

*"The Church and Law Enforcement," VI (May 15, 1924), p. 15.

*"The Church and the N.I.R.A., " XV (August 3, 1933), p. 18.

*"The Church and Politics," VI (September 25, 1924), p. 14

*"The Church and Religion," XII (November 21, 1929), pp. 3 and 4.

*"The Church and Social and Industrial Questions," VIII (January 21, 1926), p. 15.

"Church and State Not Identical," VII (December 4, 1924), p. 4.

"Church and State," II (July 1, 1920), p. 152.

"The Church and War," VI (July 31, 1924), p. 15.

*"The Church's Authority Ends at the Church Doors," IV (July 20, 1922), p. 17.

"The Churches Face Economic Depression," XIII (December 11, 1930), pp. 4 and 5.

"The Church in Politics," II (June 10, 1920), p. 88.

*"Church Officials on Reduced Armaments," XIV (July 14, 1932), p. 2.

"The Church(s Social Obligations as Laymen View It," IV (December 22, 1921), p. 17.

*"The Church Speaks to Labor," XXVIII (July 10, 1946), pp. 19 and 20.

*"The Church that Sticks to the Gospel," IX (November 18, 1926), p. 13.

"Civilizing War," IV (January 26, 1922), p. 17.

*"Concerning Another War," XVI (May 24, 1934), p. 15.

*"A Conference for Applied Christianity," VIII (December 3, 1925), p. 15.

"Conflicting Views on the Relation of Church and State," VI (May 15, 1924), p. 14.

"Conscience and Citizenship," XIII (June 18, 1931), p. 15.

*"Conscientious Citizens," XIV (September 29, 1932), p. 15.

*"Conscientious Objectors," XXIII (October 2, 1940), p. 18.

*"A Corporation that Avoids Labor Trouble," VI (November 22, 1923), p. 15.

*"A Crime Against Society," IV (February 9, 1922), pp. 16 and 17.

*"Cultured Communism," XVII (February 7, 1935), p. 14.

"The Cure of Social Unrest," I (October 2, 1919), p. 452.

*"Decoration Day," XI (May 30, 1929), p. 14.

*"A Difference of Opinion," XIX (December 24, 1936), p. 17.

"Disarmament," IV (October 13, 1921), p. 3.

*"Discussion on Preventing War in the Labor World," V (September 20, 1923), p. 14.

*"Discussion of Statement by the Federal Council of Churches on the Conference of Naval Armaments," XII (January 16, 1930), p. 4.

"Divided Opinion on Social Legislation," XVIII (October 31, 1935), p. 14.

"The Divorce Evil," I (December 4, 1919), p. 642.

*"Divorce and Remarriage," III (October 7, 1920), p. 17.

*"Divorce Proceedings," II (September 23, 1920), p. 346.

"Dr. Butler's Violent Attack on the Volstead Law," VI (May 15, 1924), pp. 4 and 11.

*"Does the State Punish out of Revenge," X (December 15, 1927), p. 15.

"Dragging the Church into Politics," VI (December 27, 1923), p. 4.

*"Drink and Drugs," I (June 5, 1919), p. 119.

*"The Drink Question," XXIII (January 23, 1919), p. 1.

*"Easier Asked than Answered," XXIII (August 20, 1941), pp. 16 and 17.

*"An Economic and Ethical Religion," II (May 13, 1920), p. 24.

*"Editor's Easy Chair," I (July 10, 1919), p. 210.

" The Eighteenth Amendment - Prohibition," II (June 24, 1920), p. 126.

"The Eighteenth Amendment's Repeal," XV (March 2, 1933), p. 17.

"The Ever-Present Volstead Act," XI (March 14, 1929), p. 4.

*"Expecting too Much of Prohibition," I (May 22, 1919), p. 71.

"The Federal Council's 'Labor Day' Bulletin," IV (September 7, 1922), p. 4.

*"The Feminine Invasion," I (March 25, 1920), p. 944.

*"For Example the Liquor Evil," VIII (March 4, 1926), p. 4.

*"Forced Readjustment of Wages," III (December 2, 1920), p. 4.

*"The Fourth Liberty Loan," I (October 17, 1918), p. 16.

*"The French Accuse Americans of Harshness to their Negroes," I (August 21, 1919), p. 335.

*"The Geneva Conference on Disarmament," XIV (February 25, 1932), p. 15.

*"Good Advice," XIV (October 8, 1931), p. 13.

"Good Industrial Preaching," XXIII (January 16, 1919), p. 2.

"Governmental Use of the Church," I (May 1, 1919), p. 4.

*"The Greatest Problem," VII (July 30, 1925), p. 25.

"Has Prohibition Failed?" III (June 9, 1921), p. 16.

*"Hatred and Godlessness Will Wreck Plan," XIII (May 28, 1931), p. 15.

*"Have 'The Poor' Received the Gospel?" XIII (December 25, 1930, p. 14.

*"How the Church Becomes Involved," V (January 4, 1923), pp. 5 and 6.

"How to Breed Bolshevism," III (December 30, 1920), p. 17.

"How to Cure Labor Unrest," I (November 6, 1919), p. 550.

"Important Education Bill Endangered," III (June 30, 1921), p. 17.

*"Impressed with the Inner Mission," II (July 29, 1920), p. 216.

*"In Behalf of Fair Competition," XVII (June 6, 1935), p. 14.

"Industrial Unrest," XXIII (October 17, 1918), p. 1.

*"Industry As Service," I (August 21, 1919), p. 334.

*"Injustice Charged," XIV (August 4, 1932), p. 12.

*"Inner Mission and the Individual," XXIII (December 26, 1918), p. 3.

*"Intense Antagonism to Religion," XII (March 6, 1930), p. 17.

*"In Time of War," XXIV (December 17, 1941), pp. 16 and 17.

*"Is Democracy Safe for the United States?" I (November 20, 1919), p. 602.

"Is a Real Peace Coming?" XXIII (January 9, 1919), p. 2.

*"Is There a Christian Communism?" XIX (February 11, 1937), p. 13.

"Is There a Red Menace in America?" I (February 12, 1920), p. 834.

"January 16th a Seventh Anniversary," IX (January 27, 1927), p. 3.

*"Japanese-Americans Evacuated," XXIV (August 26, 1942), p. 14.

*"Justice Taft on Prohibition," V(August 30, 1923), p. 3.

"The Kingdom Idea," XIV (November 12, 1931), p. 1.

*"Labor Announces Its Program," I (May 15, 1919), p. 55.

*"Labor and the Church," IX (August 25, 1927), p. 4.

*"Labor and the Railroad Problem," I (January 8, 1920), p. 736.

*"Labor Not Hostile to the Church," IX (October 21, 1926), p. 15.

"The Labor Question," I (May 29, 1919), p. 91.

"The League of Nations, I (July 3, 1919), p. 201.

*"A League of Nations to Keep World Peace," XXIII (November 28, 1918), pp.4 and 5.

*"Let Labor Disown Its Radicals," I (January 8, 1920), p. 734.

*"'The Literary Digest's' Prohibition Poll," XIV (March 31, 1932), p. 15.

*"Liquor Control a Farce," XXI (March 22, 1939), p. 15.

*"Liquor Legislation," XIV (January 7, 1932), p. 14.

"The Liquor Problem," XIV (July 21, 1932), p. 14.

"The Liquor Problem," XV (August 17, 1933), p. 17.

"The Liquor Question," X (August 30, 1928), p. 14.

*"The Ludlow Proposal," XX (January 12, 1938), p. 15.

*"The Lutheran Attitude Toward Industrial Questions," III (July 14, 1921), p. 16.

*"The Lutheran Attitude Toward Interdenominational Movements," II (August 19, 1920), p. 264.

*"The Lutheran Attitude Toward Interdenominational Movements," II (September 9, 1920), p. 314.

*"The Lutheran Church and the Outlawry of War," (Open Letters), VI (August 14, 1924), p. 23.

*"Lutherans in the War," XVII (November 8, 1934), p. 15.

*"Lutheran Pronouncement on War," VI (June 19, 1924), p. 3.

*"The Luther Statue," X (January 5, 1928), p. 21.

*"'The Lutheran' Suggests" XXII (June 19, 1940), p. 21.

"The Lynching Record," III (July 28, 1921), p. 17.

*"Marriage Not a Purely Civil Contract," IV (March 23, 1922), pp. 16 and 17.

*"Majority Action and Inaction," XX (March 30, 1938), p. 15.

*"A Message from the Oxford Conference to the Christian Churches," XIX (August 18,1937), pp. 2 and 21.

"A Milder Bolshevism," XXIII (January 9, 1919), p. 1.

*"Military Training and Personality," II (June 3, 1920), p. 68.

*"A 'Minority' Situation," XVIII (February 20, 1936), p. 15.

"More Patriotic to Country Than to God," XXIII (October 3, 1918), p. 1.

*"A National Problem," I (August 14, 1919), p. 312.

*"National Prohibition," XXIII (January 23, 1919), p. 2.

*"No Bolshevism in America," XXIII (January 23, 1919), p. 2.

*"No Race Legislation," XXIX (April 2, 1947), p. 8.

*"Not Comparable," XIX (January 14, 1937), p. 15.

*"No War For Us," XX (September 21, 1938), p. 15.

*"N.R.A. Indorsed by Lutheran Editors' and Managers' Association," XVI (October 5, 1933), p. 24.

*"Official Organ of the Soviet Government Bureau," I (December 4, 1919), p. 643.

*"On an Errand of Peace," XIX (December 10, 1936), p. 14.

"On Earth Peace," IV (November 17, 1921), p. 16.

*"On the Separation of Church and State, VI (August 21, 1924), p. 14.

*"Our Brother in Black," XVIII (July 9, 1936), p. 11.

*"Pacifism and War," XXIV (January 21, 1942), p. 15.

*"A Paragraph Political," II (September 23, 1920), p. 346.

*"Peace Crusade," XXIX (April 21, 1937), p. 12.

*"Personal Liberty," X (August 30, 1928), p. 14.

*"Political 'Isms'," XXIX (November 5, 1936), p. 4.

" Political Platforms," VI (September 18, 1924), p. 4.

"Prohibition", IV (August 10, 1922), p. 24.

"Politicians Partly Right," X (February 2, 1928), p. 3.

"Pope and Politics," VII (October 16, 1924), p. 15.

"The Power to Dissolve Marriage," X (June 21, 1928), p. 5.

*"Prayers for Disarmament," III (September 22, 1921), pp. 3 and 4.

"Presbyterians and Divorce," X (December 1, 1927), p. 13.

"President Wilson's New-World Vision," XXIII (October 3, 1918), p. 1.

"The Principle Involved in Citizenship," XII (February 6, 1930), p. 3.

"Prohibition Prognostics," I (May 15, 1919), p. 50.

*"Quit Criticizing the Law: Obey It," V (July 19, 1923), p. 10.

*"Race Relations," XIX (February 4, 1937), p. 14.

*"The Railroad Problem - A Very Live Question," I (September 4, 1919), p. 372.

*"Railroads to be Turned Back to Their Owners," I (January 8, 1920), p. 736

"The Real Task of the Christian Church," XXIII (December 5, 1918), p.1.

*"Recognition of Soviet Russia," XVI (October 19, 1933, p. 15.

"To Reimburse the Liquor Interests," III (March 31, 1921), p. 24.

"Religion and Industry," XXI (August 30, 1939), p. 14.

*"Religion and Politics," XIV (August 11, 1932), p. 14.

"Religious Pacifism," V (January 18, 1923), pp. 16 and 17.

*"Report by the Federal Council of Churches on the Eighteenth Amendment," VIII (October 1, 1925), p. 4.

*"The Right to Strike," IV (August 24, 1922), pp. 3 and 4.

"Seeing the Crisis Through," XIII (February 26, 1931), pp. 3 and 15.

"The Selections for Military Service," XXIII (November 6, 1940), p. 17.

*"Shall Prohibition Prohibit?" III (February 3, 1921), p. 17.

"Stelzle on Industrial Unrest," II (July 22, 1920), p. 194.

*"Shall Sovietism Be Recognized?" I (April 29, 1920), p. 1026.

"Shorter Hours," V (October 5, 1922), p. 3.

*"Should the Church Engage in an Anti-Vice Crusade?" VI (November 15, 1923), p. 21.

"Sidelines Wrong Place for the Church," XIII (February 12, 1931), p. 5.

*"The Situation in Russia," XIII (December 4, 1930), p. 12.

*"Social Problems," XXIII (August 27, 1941), p. 18.

*"Social Reconstruction," XVII (January 31, 1935), p. 15.

"Social Unrest and the Church," II (July 1, 1920), p. 146.

"Sociology in Place of Theology," XXIII (December 12, 1918), p. 2.

*"Soldiering in 'Just Wars'," XXIII (December 11, 1940), p. 17.

"The Solution of the Social Problems," I (July 10, 1919), p. 210.

*"Soviet Marriage Laws," XI (July 1, 1920), p. 151.

"Superficial Optimism," IV (December 29, 1921), pp. 16 and 17.

*"Sweat Shop Horrors," XV (December 1, 1932), p. 15.

"That State-Church Apparition," IX (November 18, 1926), p. 12.

"The Time to Help," XIII (March 26, 1931), p. 14.

*"Training for Home Life," XXIII (December 5, 1918), p. 10.

"Two Spheres One Conscience," XII (August 7, 1930), pp. 15.

*"Un-American and Undesirable," XX (April 20, 1938), p. 11.

*"Unemployment and Basic Industries," X (July 5, 1928), pp. 14 and 15.

"Unemployment and the Churches," XII (March 20, 1930), p. 14.

*"A United Front Against Divorce," V (April 5, 1923), p. 16.

*"U.L.C.A. Action Commended," XV (November 17, 1932), p. 15.

*"War Threats," XVII (April 11, 1935), p. 15.

*"We Can Avoid War," XXII (October 4, 1939), pp. 12 and 13.

*"We Oppose Strikes and Lockouts," V (January 25, 1923),p. 3.

*"What Does the American Negro Want?" I (October 9, 1919), pp. 472 and 473.

"What of the New World Industrially, Commercially and Socially? XXIII (October 24, 1918), p. 8.

*"What Is Your Answer?" XIX (October 1, 1936), p. 15.

*"What to Do with Socialists and Anarchists," I (March 4, 1920), p. 886.

*"What Will Prevent War?" XXIII (January 9, 1918), p. 1.

"Why so Many Divorces?" VII (April 23, 1925), p. 15.

*"The Will For Peace," X (September 6, 1928), p. 13.

*"Will Business Have a New Conscience?" XXIII (December 19, 1918), p. 10.

*"The Will of the People," XII (January 23, 1930), p. 4.

*"The World Court Defeat," XVII (February 14, 1935), p. 15.

*"A Worthy Declaration," VIII (January 14, 1926), p. 15.

*"A Year of Repeal," XVII (December 13, 1934), p. 13.

Other Periodicals

*Allbeck, Willard D., "Humanitarianism and Inner Mission," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIV (October, 1941), 378-391.

*Bagger, Henry, H., "Moral and Social Pronouncements and Their Parish Application," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XXI (October, 1948), pp. 307-327.

Bergendoff, Conrad, "Church and State in the Reformation Period," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (January, 1930), 36-62.

*_____, "The Responsibility of the Church in the World's Social Improvement," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (October, 1944), 366-369.

*Blackwelder, Oscar F., "The Obligation of the Church (The Church and Society: A Symposium)," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (October, 1944), 361-366.

*_____, "The Columbus Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, X (January, 1937), 1-12.

*Bristol, James E., "Conscientious Queries of a Clergyman," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (April, 1938), 182-184.

*Brokhoff, John R., "Is the South Less Christian in Race Relations?," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XX (July, 1947), 247-252.

*Cressman, Charles P., "The Stabilization of Marriage and Family Life," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIX (July, 1946), 261-270.

*Distler, Carl, Inner Mission Work, I (September 15, 1933), 1.

*Dressler, Hugo L., "Religion in An Era of Social Change," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VIII (April, 1935), 133-150.

*Fischer, Emil E., "The Christian and the Economic Order," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (January, 1938), 27-42.

*_____, "The Christian Ethics of Industrialism," The Lutheran Church Review, XLI (April, 1922), 168-174.

*_____, "Christianity and Sociology," The Lutheran Church Review, XLIII (January, 1924), 22-26.

*_____, "The Church and Social Problems," The Lutheran Church Review, (July, 1924), 252-263.

*_____, "Some Values in the Social Gospel," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, II (April, 1929), 129-140.

*_____, "The Stockholm Conference," The Lutheran Church Review, XLIV (October, 1925), 281-295.

*Fischer, M. Hadwin, "Civil and Religious Liberty," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, I (July, 1928), 265-301.

*Flack, E.E., "The Hartwick Seminary Conference on the Social Mission of the Church," Social Missions Quarterly, V (March 15, 1944), 1 and 2.

*Fretz, Franklin K., "The Church and Her Approach to Social Problems," The Lutheran Church Review, XLI (July, 1922), 253-257.

*_____, "Our Need For a Social Primer," Inner Mission Work, II (June 15, 1935), p. 6.

*Greever, Walter, "Major Responsibilites of the Church in Social Action," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (October, 1944), 369-373.

*Greth, Morris, "Social Problems and the Christian Church," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VI (July, 1933), 292-299.

*Haas, John A.W., "Economic Theory and Christianity," The Lutheran Church Review, XXXVIII (October, 1919), 384-390.

Hall, Arthur, J., "Fundamental Factors in World Peace," The Lutheran Quarterly, XLIX (January, 1919), 61-72.

Hamsher, Paul O,, "Applied Christianity: A Call to Self-Examination," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIX (April, 1946), 188-195.

*"Hartwick Social Action School," Social Missions Quarterly, IX (September 15, 1948), 3.

*Heiges, Donald R., "The Ethic of Jesus and the Practice of War," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (April, 1944), 124-144.

Heindel, John E., "Inner Mission - Its Name - Its Field - Its Work," The Lutheran Quarterly, XLIX (January, 1919), 73-81.

*Hoh, Paul, "The Church and Pastor in Wartime," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XV (July, 1942), 240-266.

*"Is Peacetime Conscription the Solution?" Social Missions Quarterly, VII (June 15, 1946), 3 and 4.

*Jacobs, Charles M., "The Relation of Church and State," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIV (January, 1941), 71-76.

*Jackson, Malcolm Aage, "The Negro and the United Lutheran Church," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIII (October, 1940), 415-418.

*"Keep the U.S.A. Out of the War," Social Missions Quarterly, I (March 15, 1940), 5 and 6.

*Keiter, Herman, "The Church and the Pacifist," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIII (July, 1940), 244-252.

*Kirsch, Paul, "The Church's Strategy For Survival," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIV (July, 1941), 262-276.

*Kistler, Charles E., "No New World As Yet," The Lutheran Church Review, XXXIX (January, 1920), 19-24.

*Klick, Richard C., "Conscientious Queries of Another Clergyman," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (July, 1938), 298-301.

*Knubel, F.H., "The Chief Problems of Lutheran Missionary Work that Arise from the Present Situation," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, II (October, 1929), 393-408.

*_____, "Society, The State, and the Church," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XII (July, 1939), 235-241.

*Koch, C. Franklin, "The Function of the Church in a Time of War," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XV (July, 1942), 267-273.

*_____, "Seiminar on Social Action," Lutheran Men, XXII (September, 1942), 8 and 9.

*Koeberle, Adolph, "The Social Problem in the Light of the Augsburg Confession," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1945), 258-275.

*Lammond, H.W., "Reflections of the Gospel and Our Social Ills," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIII (January, 1940), 44-54.

*"The Leaders Listened," Social Missions Quarterly, IX (September 15, 1948), 3.

*Lenski, Gerhard E., "The Church's Responsibility in Marriage," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (July, 1938), 251-264.

*Letts, Harold C., "Three In One," Social Missions Quarterly, VIII (December 15, 1947), 2.

*_____, "Toward a New Lutheran Ethic," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (January, 1944), 14-27.

Maroni, J., "The Lutheran Church and the Social Crisis," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, II (October, 1929), 428-436.

*Mattes, John C., "The Church and War," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVI (April, 1943), 132-150.

*Mattson, A.D., "The Church and the Labor Movement," Social Missions Quarterly, IV (June 15, 1943), 4.

*Miller, Herman F., "Threats to the Church's Independence," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XI (October, 1938), 349-354.

*Mueller, P.W., "The Teaching of Scripture on Divorce," The Lutheran Church Review, January, 1924), 49-64.

*Nolde, O. Frederick, "The Church and World Peace," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XV (July, 1942), 249-266.

*Offermann, Henry, "Jesus and the Social Question," The Lutheran Church Review, XL (January, 1921), 22-35.

*Pfatteicher, E.P., "Christianity and the Home," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VII (July, 1934), 283-295.

*Pflum, H.J., "The Church's Opportunities and Limitations as an Agency for Moral and Social Welfare," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, I (January, 1928), 64-74.

*Peery, T. Benton, "American Lutheran Preaching," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XII (October, 1939), 410-423.

*_____, "More About Lutheran Preaching Today," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIV (April, 1941), 206-209.

*"Projects in Social Action," Social Missions Quarterly, IX (December 15, 1948), 2.

*Putman, Dwight F., "The Church and the Post-War World," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVII (April, 1944), 145-165.

*_____, "How Christian Is the North In Race Relations?" The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XX (July, 1947), 253-260.

*_____, "War and Religion: An Unholy Alliance ," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, IX (April, 1936), 197-205.

*Ramsey, Paul, "A Theology of Social Action," Social Action, XII (October 15, 1946), entire issue.

*Reinartz, F. Eppling, "The Church and War," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, V (October, 1932), 341-359.

Robinson, S.L. (Mrs.), "Christian Socialism - A Contradiction in Terms," The Lutheran Quarterly, LIV (January, 1924), 34-48.

*Sanders, C.F., "Civilization is Sick: What Can Be Done About It?" The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VII (July, 1934), 296-306.

*Schaeffer, Charles E., "A Critique of Popular Fallacies," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XXI (April, 1948), 146-160.

*Schiotz, Fredrik, "Pre-Marital Counseling," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVIII (October, 1945), 367-385.

*"School on World Order," Social Missions Quarterly, IX (December 15, 1948), 3.

*Smith, Franklin P., "The Heresy of the Modern State," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIX (July, 1946), 302-305.

Stamm, R.T., (Book Review), "The Pride of Graystone," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, I (April, 1928), 238-239.

*_____, "The Economic Factor in the Genesis of Christianity," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VI (July, 1933), 268-291.

*_____, "Fractional Thinking and Lutheran Inhibitions," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIII (April, 1940), 124-130.

*_____, "The Lag Between the Ethics of the State and the Ethics of the Kingdom of God," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, IV (July, 1931), 233-260.

*_____, "The New Testament and the Divorce Question," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, III (April, 1930), 188-196.

*Tabor, L. Ralph, "Unofficial Movements in the United Lutheran Church - The Lutheran Social Fellowship," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XIII (July, 1940), 293-296.

Tope, Homer W., "Prohibition and the Amendment," The Lutheran Quarterly, XLIX (October, 1919), 489-493.

*Vannorsdall, John, "Luther and the Church's Responsibility for Society," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XXI (April, 1948), 161-168.

*Venable, Charles L., "Religion and the Profit Motive," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1945), 151-156.

*_____, "The Root of the Race Question," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, XVIII (July, 1945), 297-299.

*Wentz, Abdel Ross, "Martin Luther and Modern Business," The Lutheran Church Quarterly, VII (January, 1934), 41-54.

Wickey, Gould, "Has Oxford Spoken to Our Condition?" The Lutheran Church Quarterly, X (October, 1937), 333-340.

2. Secondary Sources

Bainton, R.H., "The Churches and War: Historic Attitudes toward Christian Participation," Social Action, XI (January 15, 1945), entire issue.

*Berggrav, Eivind, "State and Church - The Lutheran View," The Lutheran Quarterly (new series), IV (November, 1952), 353-376.

*Gerberding, R. H., In "Conscientious Objectors and the Lutheran Church," (A Symposium), The National Lutheran, VIII (December, 1939), 16-22.

Guy, Norman M., "The Development of Modern Social Consciousness," The Drew Gateway, Madison, N.J., XI (Summer, 1940), 53-55.

Keehn, Thomas and Underwood, Kenneth, "Protestants in Political Action," Social Action, XVI (June 15, 1950), entire issue. An excellent description of the role of the Church in political action. This goes beyond that which the U.L.C.A. would consider legitimate activity by the Church.

*Ramsey, Paul, "A Theology of Social Action," Social Action, XII (October 15, 1946), entire issue.

*"Social - Economic Status and Outlook of Religious Groups in America," Information Service (published by the Department of Research and Education, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America), XXVII (May 15, 1948), entire issue.

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

*Geisler, Albert Urban, Official Pronouncements of the United Lutheran Church in America Relating to Certain Moral and Social

Problems. Typewritten. Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the University of Pittsburgh, 1941, 141 pp. plus bibliography. This study deals primarily with official pronouncements of the predecessor bodies of the U.L.C.A.

Guy, Norman M., The English Agricultural Labourer's Movement and the Church of England, 1872-1896. Typewritten. Ph.D. dissertation submitted to Harvard University, 1947, 940 pp.
This careful and exhaustive study of the reaction of the Church of England to a particular social and economic movement has served both as a model of form and has been of particular interest in comparing church attitudes.

*Lentz, Harold H., History of the Social Gospel in the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in America, 1867-1918. Typewritten. Ph.D. dissertation submitted to Yale University, 1943, 390 pp.
This research deals in a comprehensive fashion with one of the predecessor bodies of the U.L.C.A.

D. BOOKS

1. Reference Works

*Jacobs, Henry Eyster, ed., Book of Concord (Philadelphia: G.W. Frederick, 1882), two volumes. Vol. I, 671 pp.
The symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church with historical introduction and notes.

*_____, A Summary of the Christian Faith (Philadelphia: General Council Publication House, 1905), 637 pp.
This has been a standard exposition of Lutheran doctrine.

_____, Works of Martin Luther (Philadelphia: A.J. Holman Company, 1915 and 1932), six volumes.

Jacobs, Henry Eyster and Haas, John A.W., editors, The Lutheran Cyclopedia (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1905), 572 pp.
Brief articles on persons and events important to the Lutheran Church.

Neve, Juergen Ludwig, Introduction to Lutheran Symbolics (Burlington, Iowa: German Literary Board, 1917), 439 pp.
A historical survey of the Ecumenical and particular creeds of the Lutheran Church, an outline of their contents, and an interpretation of their theology on the basis of the doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession.

_____, A Guide to the Augsburg Confession; Its History and Its Theology (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1927), 266 pp.
Gives an interpretation of each Article of the Augsburg Confession.

2. Primary Sources

*Fischer, Emil E., Social Problems (Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1927), 181 pp.
A discussion of the application of Christian principles to various social relationships, written from an evangelical point of view.

Fritz, F.H., The Family (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1925), 83 pp.
Published under the auspices of the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare of the U.L.C.A. as a study book on marriage, divorce, the training of the child and the family in industry.

*Greever, Walton H., Human Relationships and the Church (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1939), 96 pp.
An important discussion of what the Church may and may not do with reference to society by the secretary of the U.L.C.A.

*Heisey, Paul and Traver, Amos, Studies in Social Problems (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1938), 86 pp.
Study book prepared under the auspices of the Parish and Church School Board of the U.L.C.A.

Jacobs, Charles M., The Way (Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1922), 178 pp.

_____, What Then Is Christianity? (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1940), 136 pp. Esp. Chapter VI, "Christianity and Character."
An interpretation of the meaning of the ethical teaching of Jesus.

*Knubel, Frederick H., Our Church (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1924), 170 pp. (Key books; vol. 1).
An official study book of the origin, principles and activities of the U.L.C.A.

*Krauss, Paul H., A Lamp of Burnished Gold (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1941), 144 pp.
A study of the U.L.C.A. and its work prepared under the auspices of the Parish and Church School Board of the U.L.C.A.

Nolde, O. Frederick, Christian World Action (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1942), 113 pp. (Revised 1943, 127 pp.).
A study book on aspects of world peace and the role of the Church.

_____, Power for Peace (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), 138 PP.
Discussion of the relation of the Church to world peace and especially to the United Nations.

*Pfatteicher, E.P., Christian Social Science (New York, Falcon Press, 1938), 191 pp.
Kessler Foundation Lectures delivered at Hamma Divinity School.

Rudisill, Earl S., Christian Family Life (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1944), 90 pp.
A study book prepared under the auspices of the Parish and Church School Board of the U.L.C.A.

Sittler, Joseph, Jr., The Doctrine of the Word (Philadelphia: The Board of Publication of the U.L.C.A., 1948), 69 pp. (The Knubel-Miller Lectures, third series).
A brief but excellent presentation of the Lutheran doctrine of the Word as it passed from the Reformation period, through the formulations of Orthodoxy to the present period of reconstruction.

Tappert, Theodore G., The Church Through the Ages (Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1941), 144 pp.
A study of the history of the Christian Church.

Traver, Amos John, A Lutheran Handbook (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, Revised edition 1949), 100 pp. (First edition, 1936).
This handbook used often in adult membership classes, is helpful in gaining knowledge of the spirit which motivates the U.L.C.A.

*Wentz, Abdel Ross, The Lutheran Church in American History (Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1923 and 1933), second edition, 465 pp.

3. Secondary Sources

Lutheran Authors

*Aulén, Gustav, Church, Law and Society (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1948), 114 pp.
An immensely important book by a Scandanavian

Lutheran theologian. It reminds the Church of its responsibility for Law in its relationship to society.

*Berggrav, Eivind, Man and State, translated by George Aus, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1951), 319 pp.
An important book which grew out of the author's experiences in living under a totalitarian government. It stresses the fact that the Church has a responsibility for justice in society.

Boehmer, Heinrich, Road to Reformation, translated by John W. Doberstein and Theodore Tappert, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), 449 pp.

*Carlson, Edgar M., The Reinterpretation of Luther (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), 256 pp.
The results of four decades of intensive research into the theology of Luther by Swedish scholars.

Evjen, J.O., The Life of J.H.W. Stuckenberg (Minneapolis: Lutheran Free Church Publishing Company, 1928), 535 pp.

Ferm, Vergilius T., The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology (New York, London: The Century Co., 1927), 409 pp.
A careful account of the doctrinal controversy which originally split the General Synod in the nineteenth century and caused the formation of the General Council on a much more conservative basis.

_____, editor, What Is Lutheranism? (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1930), 307 pp.
A series of essays by twelve Lutheran leaders from many branches of the Lutheran Church on the question of the title. It is difficult to analyze the result of all this except that there is much disagreement. In the last chapter, Ferm draws several important conclusions.

*Haas, John A.W., The Problem of the Christian State (Boston: The Stratford Company, 1928), 199 pp.

Heinecken, Martin J., Basic Christian Teachings (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), 148 pp.
An excellent summary of basic Christian beliefs simply presented in the form of a study book.

Jordan, Hermann, Luther's Staatsauffassung (Munchen, Verlag von Muller and Frohlich, 1917), 202 pp.
A good development of Luther's position on the nature and function of the State.

The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, translated by Theodore Tappert and John Doberstein (Philadelphia: The Evangelical

Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania and Adjacent States and the Muhlenberg Press, 1942-1945), three volumes.

Kantonen, T.A., The Message of the Church to the World of Today (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1941), 165 pp. Esp. Chapters IV and VI.
A Lutheran view of the nature of the Church is presented, and on the basis of this, a discussion of what the Church can properly do in the world.

Keiter, Herman, Christian What About Society? (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1951), 97 pp.
A study book which attempts to focus the thinking of Christians on their duty to meet social problems.

*Lenski, Gerhard E., Marriage in the Lutheran Church (Columbus: Lutheran Book Concern, 1936), 377 pp.
A comprehensive analysis by a Lutheran clergyman. As a by-product of its major subject, it also contributes to an understanding of Lutheran social ethics.

Ohl, J., The Inner Mission (Philadelphia: General Council Publishing House, 1911), 253 pp.
This is the classic exposition of the idea of the Inner Mission by the American Lutheran leader who was most influential in spreading it in America.

Proceedings of the Lutheran World Federation Assembly (Philadelphia: United Lutheran Publication House, 1948), 190 pp.
This is the official record of the organizational meeting of the Lutheran World Federation in Lund, Sweden in 1948.

Qualben, Lars P., The Lutheran Church in Colonial America (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1940), 320 pp.
A good book for a survey of Lutheran contributions in colonial days as well as for particular problems faced by Lutherans.

Reu, Johann Michael, Thirty-Five Years of Luther Research (Chicago, Wartburg Publishing House, 1917), 155 pp.
An attempt to present the major Luther research done between 1883 and 1917. In the listing and description of research on particular phases of Luther's life and theology, none deals with social attitudes.

Stuckenberg, John Henry Wilburn, Christian Sociology (New York: I.K. Funk and Company, 1880), 379 pp.
An attempt to develop a system of Christian Sociology by a pioneer Lutheran clergyman and teacher.

Wahlstrom, Eric H., The New Life in Christ (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1950), 295 pp. Esp. Chapter V, "The Christian Way of Life."

This is a theological interpretation of what it means to have new life in Christ as presented by St. Paul. In the last chapter this is related to such things as the family, the Church, the world and the state.

Non-Lutheran Authors

Abbott, Lyman, Christianity and Social Problems (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1897), 370 pp.

"Christ's mission was two-fold, - individual and social; to make men worthy to be called the children of God, and also to make a state of society on earth worthy to be called the Kingdom of God." It is with the latter that this book deals.

Bainton, Roland Herbert, Here I Stand; A Life of Martin Luther (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1950), 422 pp.

Bennett, J.C., Christian Ethics and Social Policy (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1946), 132 pp.

An analysis of the relevance of Christian ethics to political and economic decisions.

_____, Social Salvation (New York, Scribner's and Sons, 1935), 222 pp.

A religious approach to the problems of social change.

*Bogardus, Emory S., Sociology (New York: Macmillan Company, 1949), third edition, 415 pp.

Booth, Henry Kendall, The Great Galilean Returns (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1936), 218 pp.

The Gospel of Jesus is centered in His Kingdom of God idea. The book examines what happened to that idea historically from the early Church to the great social awakening of more modern times.

Chaffee, Edmund Bigelow, The Protestant Churches and the Industrial Crisis (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1933), 243 pp.

The basic thesis of this book is that Jesus came preaching social as well as individual redemption. The author, who was Minister of the Labor Temple in New York, applies that faith to various aspects of the industrial crisis.

*Douglass, Harlan Paul and Brunner, Edmund de S., The Protestant Church as a Social Institution (New York and London: Harper and

Brothers, 1935), 368 pp.
A well-known study of the functioning of the Church as an institution of society. This is based upon surveys made of large numbers of congregations.

Ferre, Nels Frederick Solomon, Christianity and Society (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 280 pp.
An extensive theological discussion in which Christian social action is discussed with reference to "Agape" and the work of the Holy Spirit.

Gillin, John Lewis, et. al., Social Problems (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1943), Third edition, 528 pp.

Gladden, Washington, Applied Christianity, (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1894), 320 pp.
Moral aspects of social questions. The teachings of Christianity as they apply to social (particularly economic) questions.

*Hopkins, Charles Howard, The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915 (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press, 1940), 352 pp.
This is the most comprehensive history of the development of the Social Gospel in America available.

Johnson, F. Ernest, The Church and Society (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: The Abingdon Press, 1935), 224 pp.
Especially valuable for its statement of the problems confronting the Church as it seeks to exercise a social function.

_____, The Social Gospel Re-Examined (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1940) 261 pp. (Rauschenbusch Lectures, 1939).
A criticism of liberal social Christianity and an attempt to indicate some basic elements of a Christian social ethic. Takes more recent developments in theology and in society into consideration.

Kerr, Hugh Thomson, Jr., editor, A Compend of Luther's Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), 253 pp.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott, editor, The Gospel, the Church and the World (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946), 229 pp. (The Interseminary Series, vol. III).

MacMurray, John, Creative Society (New York: Association Press, 1936), 166 pp.
A study of the relation of Christianity to communism.

Valuable for its penetrating analysis of Christianity and for its exposition of the contribution and dangers of relating Christianity to the social order.

*Myrdal, Gunnar, An American Dilemma (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), two volumes.

A comprehensive study of the race problem in America by a Swedish sociologist. Based on investigations made by many American writers as well as personal research by the author.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, The Kingdom of God in America (Chicago: Willet, Clark and Company, 1937), 215 pp.

A history of the inward transformation of American conceptions of the Kingdom of God from the Puritan theocracy to the Social Gospel.

_____, The Social Sources of Denominationalism (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1929), 304 pp.

A discussion of the influence of social factors on the establishment and perpetuation of denominations.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics (New York: Harper, 1935), 244 pp. Rauschenbusch Memorial Lectures (1934).

Some of Niebuhr's basic thought. A keen analysis of the foundations of the ethic of Jesus and of "the relevance of an impossible ethical ideal,"

_____, The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1944), 190 pp.

Discussion of the relation of Christian ethics to contemporary social problems.

Oldham, J.H., series editor, Christian Faith and the Common Life (Chicago, New York: Willet, Clark and Company, 1938), 195 pp. (The Oxford Conference Books, vol. IV).

Essays on the relation of the Christian faith to the life of the world by some of the leading Christian thinkers of the world.

_____, series editor, Church and Community (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1938), 259 pp. (Official Oxford Conference Book).

Essays on the relationship of Church and community.

*_____, The Oxford Conference (Official Report), (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937), 290 pp.

The Oxford Conference Report is the best non-Roman Catholic source for corporate Christian social teaching.

Peabody, Francis Greenwood, Jesus Christ and the Social Question (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900), 374 pp.
An examination of the teaching of Jesus in its relation to some of the problems of social life, viz., the family, the rich, the poor, the industrial order.

Rauschenbusch, Walter, Christianity and the Social Crisis (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907), 429 pp.
Deals with the historical roots of Christianity in the prophets and the social aims of Jesus. A new social interpretation of the Gospel.

_____, Christianizing the Social Order (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912), 493 pp.
Main importance is a moral analysis of elements in the social order to discover what is Christian and what is not. Most of the corporate organizations of society are severely indicted, especially those having to do with property.

_____, A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917), 279 pp.
Hopkins says that the Social Gospel movement culminated in the writing of this book. It makes a radical revision of orthodox Christian theology.

Recent Social Trends in the United States. Report of the President's research committee on social trends with a foreword by Herbert Hoover (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933), two volumes - paged continuously 1568 pp.

Scott, Ernest Findlay, Man and Society in the New Testament (New York: C. Scribner's and Sons, 1946), 299 pp.
An excellent book in which the social message of the New Testament finds its center in religious ideas, especially the fact of God and the fact of human personality,

*Tawney, R.H., Religion and the Rise of Capitalism (New York and Middlesex, England: Penguin. 1947), 280 pp.
One of the best discussions of the problem of the relation between Protestantism and Capitalism.

*Troeltsch, Ernst, The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches, translated by Olive Wyon, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), two volumes. Paged continuously, 1019 pp. Especially section on Lutheranism, pp. 515-576.

*Visser T Hooft, W.A. and Oldham, J.H. The Church and Its Function in Society (Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1937),

238 pp. (Official Oxford Conference Book).
A penetrating analysis of the relation between church, community and state. Especially valuable for discussion of different conceptions of the nature and function of the Church.

Ward, Harry Frederick, Our Economic Morality and the Ethic of Jesus (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929), 329 pp.
Indictment of allowing economic pursuits to develop their own morality, and a statement of the essential antagonism between the principles of Jesus and capitalistic society.

Waring, Luther Hess, The Political Theories of Martin Luther (New York: Putnam, 1910), 293 pp.

Weber, Max, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, translated by Talcott Parsons (New York: Scribner's and Sons, 1930), 292 pp.
A classic exposition of the thesis that the ethic fostered by Protestantism (especially Calvinism) stimulated the development of capitalism.

E. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Primary Sources

*Beck, Alfred L., Why I Believe in Temperance (New York: The Inner Mission Board of the U.L.C.A., ca. 1935), 4pp.

*The Church Speaks on Labor, Statement issued jointly by the Board of Social Missions and Executive Board of the U.L.C.A., 1946, 4 pp.

The Church and Social Action, Committee on Social Missions of the United Lutheran Synod of New York, (New York, n.d.), 30 pp.

*Greever, Walton H., The Bible Speaks on the Liquor Problem (New York: The Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., n.d.), 4 pp.

*_____, Facts and Forces in the Social Order (Philadelphia: Castle Press, 1932), 30 pp.
A study booklet prepared from the text of the report of the Committee on Moral and Social Welfare to the 1932 Convention of the U.L.C.A.

*Knubel, Frederick, H., The Gospel for an Age of Labor (New York: Inner Mission Board of the U.L.C.A., 1919), 12 pp.
Also in The Lutheran Quarterly, XLIX (January, 1919), 37-43.

*_____, "Inner Mission in the Life of the Church," Proceedings of the First Lutheran Inner Mission Conference, Chicago, May, 1922.

*_____, Light on Labor. Sermon included in booklet, Radio Addresses, 1931, no pagination.

Marriage and the Home, (New York: Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., n.d.), 12 pp.

*Reuss, Carl F., Planned Parenthood (New York: Monograph published by the Division of Welfare, National Lutheran Council, n.d.). Distributed by the U.L.C.A. Board of Social Missions. 8 pp.

Schweiger, Franklin J., A Program for Christian Service (New York: Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., n.d.), 32 pp.

Snyder, C.A., A Theology for the Social Message of the Church in Lutheranism, Based on Justification by Faith. Typewritten. B,D. thesis submitted to the Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, 1940. 19 pp.
A rather poor discussion, but its emphasis is upon the fact that the social message of the Lutheran Church must be and can be rooted in its basic theological doctrines.

2. Secondary Sources

Committee on Lutheran Social Action, The Church's Social Ministry, Its Principles and Problems.
Report on Lutheran Social Action prepared for the Ohio Synod, American Lutheran Church - 1947. Interesting as a comparison with the social ideas of another Lutheran church body.

Cromer, Voigt R., Christian Action in Human Relations, (New York: Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., 1952), 15 pp.
An address presented at the Southeastern Social Action Conference held at Charlotte, North Carolina, June 19-21, 1952.

Creth, Morris S., The Family and Social Change (New York: The Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., 1951), 32 pp.
The material in this pamphlet was first delivered as a series of lectures at a School on Marriage and Family Life, sponsored by the Board of Social Missions, held at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, June 18-22, 1951. It is a sociological analysis.

Johnson, Frederick Ernest, The Social Gospel and Personal Religion,

Are They in Conflict? (New York: Association Press, 1922), 49 pp.

A statement of both the personal and social purposes of the Gospel and a plea that both approaches be re-united by one who is committed to the Social Gospel.

Kantonen, T.A., The Family Under God, (New York: The Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., 1951), 30 pp.

The material in this pamphlet was first delivered as a series of lectures at the School of Marriage and Family Life, sponsored by the Board of Social Missions, held at Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, June 18-22, 1951. It is a theological analysis.

Official Pronouncements of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. Relative to Social and Industrial Relations and Social and Moral Welfare, 1910-1935, (Philadelphia: Office of the General Assembly, 1935), 73 pp. Issued by direction of the General Assembly of 1935.

Interesting by way of comparison with U.L.C.A. official statements. They are greater in quantity and more specific. Temperance received the greatest consideration with the question of peace second.

*Reu, M., The Church and the Social Problem (Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1936), 46 pp.

An address delivered at the meeting of the Lutheran World Convention, Paris, 1935.

*Statement on Human Relations, Statement issued jointly by the Board of Social Missions and the Executive Board of the U.L.C.A., 1950, 4 pp.

World Peace and Universal Military Training, Statement adopted by the Board of Social Missions of the U.L.C.A., December 7, 1951, 4 pp.

This declares faith in the United Nations Organization and recognizes the decision of the United States to re-arm, but declares against universal military training.

THE END